AMERICAN STUDIES IN PAPYROLOGY

AMERICAN STUDIES IN PAPYROLOGY
VOLUME EIGHT

THE PTOLEMAIC AND ROMAN IDIOS LOGOS

PAUL R. SWARNEY

A. M. HAKKERT LTD. TORONTO MCMLXX

Set in Aldine Roman by Ancient and Modern Book Printers, Toronto
Printed in The Netherlands

Published for
THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF PAPYROLOGISTS
by
A. M. HAKKERT LTD.
76 Charles Street West
Toronto 5, Canada

THE PUBLICATION OF THIS VOLUME WAS MADE POSSIBLE
BY A GENEROUS GRANT FROM THE SKERRYVORE FOUNDATION

Standard Book Number
88866-008-1

Library of Congress Catalogue Card Number
73-147077

Preface

This book is an investigation of a department, called the idios logos, within the Ptolemaic and Roman administration of Egypt. I stress this because idios logos invariably has been associated with the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos* and the juridical implications of that famous and important papyrus. I have, however, confined my discussion strictly to the bureaucratic history and structure of the idios logos, aspects which have been generally neglected since the publication of the Gnomon.

The idios logos was introduced, for no clearly documented reasons, during the reign of Philometor, and similarly disappeared during the reign of Septimius Severus or shortly thereafter, perhaps continuing as a title as the title prefect continued after Diocletian's reforms. Hence this investigation is incomplete, an incompleteness which must furthermore remain until such time as other departments in the Ptolemaic and Roman administrations (e.g. the *basilikon* and *dioiketes*) are more closely studied.

This study like so much of the work accomplished under the direction of C. Bradford Welles at Yale began as a commentary for a papyrus text. In the process P. Yale Inv. 289 was reduced to a brief paragraph in the third chapter and the commentary became a Ph.D. thesis presented to Yale in 1965. My research began at Yale, continued at Dartmouth College in Hanover, New Hampshire, and has been completed at York University in Toronto. The gentle persuasion of my colleagues at these institutions is herewith most gratefully acknowledged.

Credit for whatever of value appears in the following pages must be shared with Naphtali Lewis of Brooklyn College who pointed out original sins in my manuscript; Alan E. Samuel of the University of Toronto who dissected the original and whose constant prodding has brought this work to its completion; and Roger S. Bagnall of the University of Toronto whose editorial skills have aided in putting the manuscript back together again.

The first and final cause of all that follows has been C. Bradford Welles, to whose memory this book is fondly dedicated.

May, 1970 — *Paul R. Swarney*

Contents

THE PTOLEMAIC AND ROMAN IDIOS LOGOS

Introduction

Chapter One

The Ptolemaic Idios Logos

a. Myron the son of Moschos was [illegible]. (Col. 1, 5-8)

b. The land was [illegible] drachmas before Phaophi [illegible], year 19, November [illegible] (Col. 1, 5)

c. [illegible] granted [illegible] and the [illegible] by Serapi[illegible], Phaophi 16, year 29, November 18, 163 B.C. (Col. 1, 7-9)

d. On the [illegible] of Phaophi [illegible] Senkeaus (Col. [illegible])

e. The conditions of sale were:

(1) [illegible] would have possession of the land [illegible] the former [illegible] (Col. 2, [illegible])

(2) [illegible] would pay the [illegible] (Col. 2, [illegible])

(3) He would pay [illegible] the price [illegible] drachmas (Col. 2, [illegible])

[illegible]

[illegible]

(iv). The remainder of the price would be paid in the 20th and 21st years. (Col. 2.8-9)

f. Included in the bank statement was a declaration by Harendotes, the basilikogrammateus, that the land had been confiscated to the royal treasury and that it formerly belonged to Myron son of Moschos. (Col. 3.5-8)

g. Protarchos ὁ παρὰ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ on the 29th of Phaophi, year 19, drew up a διαγραφή, subscribed by Harendotes, to the effect that Harendotes had searched the land in his records and found it to be as above. (Col. 1.3-5)

h. The first installment on the sale price was deposited by Teos the trapezites in the bank at Hermonthis on Choiak 5, year 19, τέτακται βασιλεῖ εἰς τὸν ἴδιον λόγον. (Col. 1.1-2)

i. The final deposits were made in the 20th and 21st years, notice thereof being added to a copy of [illegible] (Col. 1.9-12; SB 4512.28-28)

The reason for the confiscation of Myron's property is not given, nor is there any indication of the officials involved or process by which the confiscation was effected. However, the administrative personnel who participated in the sale of Myron's land are both numerous and varied:

Teos the banker at Hermonthis, who received the first payment and deposited it to the King into the ἴδιος λόγος and who drew up either himself or through one of his assistants the receipt that has come down to us.

Protarchos ὁ παρὰ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ who received the first payment and composed the diagraphe by which it was deposited in the bank at Hermonthis and who appears to have been the highest-ranking official involved in the transaction.

Harendotes the basilikogrammateus of the Thebaid who subscribed the diagraphe confirming that the property in question had been confiscated to the royal treasury and was at the present without inundation, and whose search of the local records was probably responsible for most of the information about the land contained in the papyrus.

Ptolemaios, assistant to the strategos, Imouthes the [illegible] and a trapezites, Ptolemaios the oikonomos, Horos and Petenephotes topogrammateis, Megasthenes the phrourarch, Imouthes komogrammateus of Diospolis Magna and many others.

Archelaos, one of the military [illegible] who managed the auction, and Dionysodoros, who became banker at Hermonthis in the year 20, and who received the last payments. (SB 4512)

This auction was an event requiring the presence of a wide assortment of administrative personnel in the Thebaid. A piece of actually or potentially arable

land, even though [illegible] had been [illegible] allotted to the [illegible] and was [illegible] The [illegible] property [illegible] of [illegible] land [illegible] that appear to be [illegible] and the [illegible] than [illegible] but he did acquire property [illegible] government assignment [illegible] [illegible] the land [illegible]

[illegible] with [illegible] the property [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] by the [illegible]

[illegible] deposits [illegible] property [illegible] administration [illegible] the condition that the [illegible] pay the taxes to which the properties are liable. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] a receipt for a payment deposited in the bank at [illegible], June [illegible] B.C., was

found with its original [illegible] in excellent preservation and [illegible] in superb condition. [illegible] 1962, the administrative papers of the [illegible] being deposited in the [illegible] Archive, [illegible] comparison to the Berlin papyrus.

The [illegible] of the papyrus are as follows:

a. [illegible] (the [illegible] of his house [illegible] 2 A 1

b. The house was [illegible] the adventures of [illegible] (Col. 2 2 3

c. [illegible] was [illegible] was posted on the [illegible] was [illegible] was publicly advertised on the [illegible] (Col. 2 4

d. [illegible] of Tulo [illegible] of the [illegible] were [illegible] advertised in the Salt of Tulo and [illegible] (Col. 2 5

e. [illegible] of [illegible] (Col. 2 6

f. [illegible] (Col. 3

g. But on the [illegible] (Col. 3 4

h. [illegible] of Tulo [illegible] (Col. 3 5

i. Then the [illegible] (Col. 3 6

j. Then the [illegible] (Col. 3 7

The official [illegible] the sale of the house were [illegible] at

those who took part in the business of [illegible] 992, and in two instances are the same persons. They are, again in reverse order of proximity to the auction:

Hermodikos(?), the trapezites at Diospolis Magna, who received the payment from Damon [illegible] and in accordance with the diagramma deposited the [illegible] to the King [illegible].

Dionysios, the [illegible] who apparently took charge of the sale when Ptolemaios and Theon had left, and who composed the deposit slip which was sent [illegible] with the payment from Damon to the bank at Diospolis Magna.

Harmachis, the topogrammateus, who subscribed the deposit slip of Dionysios with instructions about the status and location of the house [illegible] received the [illegible] from Damon, and forwarded the payment into the [illegible] bank.

[illegible], the komogrammateus of [illegible] 992, who certified for Harmachis that the house was [illegible] not been paid.

Ptolemaios [illegible] and Theon, the basilikos grammateus, who at the start of the proceedings were in charge of the auction and who later departed [illegible] leaving matters in the hands of the [illegible] grammateis.

[illegible] the archiphylakites [illegible] Zeus [illegible] secretary in the office of Harmachis and [illegible] secretary for Dionysios, both of whom signed [illegible] for their respective superiors.

A variety of bureaucrats of the Thebaid had once again assembled in Diospolis Magna for an auction of government property. The auction extended from [illegible] included, [illegible] days. [illegible] the auction described in this text was the [illegible] by the officials who had come to Diospolis [illegible] a house which formerly belonged to Marres and which was [illegible] placed among the adespota, was purchased for [illegible] drachmas [illegible]. The document does not indicate why the [illegible] the house [illegible] may well be [illegible] adespota [illegible] Marres [illegible]. There is [illegible] attached to the house [illegible] were connected with the property of Marres and which allow us to speculate [illegible] to the auction of [illegible]. Whether the house had become [illegible] through the debt or the death of Marres [illegible] is not given. What is important is that the house formerly belonged to Marres and was at the time of sale in the adespota, as [illegible] the komogrammateus

certified, probably to make sure that there was no claim to the property other than the government's whose agents were the principal villains.

[illegible]

purchase. Her misdeed was discovered by [illegible] the fraud of the woman and was disclosed to Hermias. A comparison of the altered measurements of her land with the measurements in the records of the komogrammateus substantiated the accusation. The [illegible] of her property was liable to a prostimon at the handsome rate of [illegible] per aroura, which meant in her case 1200 drachmas. This prostimon, at the end of its administrative history, was deposited by the banker at Hermonthis [illegible] the [illegible] of the King and Queen.

The nature of the procedure [illegible] not only by the dramatis personae of the transaction. [illegible] described [illegible] which was [illegible] Hermias [illegible] the misdeed which called for [illegible] but elaborated [illegible] (18.32). [illegible] Pamonthes thought that the payment [illegible]. Finally, the Pamonthes, the komogrammateus, the payment [illegible] banking [illegible] the money [illegible] (16.17). As far as the [illegible] the woman that purchased the land for which she paid a price which [illegible] the proper authorities.

Hermias, on the other hand, [illegible] statement provides the basis for saying that [illegible] accurate in his description of the case. The [illegible] of the matter are not contradictory, but [illegible] the prostimon is more fully described as "for enclosing more land for the purpose of planting palms" rather than merely "for planting palms" [illegible] the fact that the land might have been [illegible] planted with trees when the [illegible] was given against [illegible] the komogrammateus [illegible] the price of property. For Hermias [illegible] the prostimon was both a [illegible] and some sort of fee to be collected from those who had [illegible] waste land, a fee which the guilty party [illegible] possession.[1]

[illegible] the banker received the prostimon after he had acquainted himself with [illegible] the payment [illegible] be deposited to the idios logos. [illegible] comments are not available. [illegible] from this affair was that [illegible] had clear possession of the waste land which she had added to her property.

[illegible] the role of the local and nome secretaries in transactions that lead to payments recorded to the idios logos, and it clarifies (1) the point in the administrative process at which the payment is determined and (2) who decides that the payment is to be [illegible]. Although Hermias apparently had full authority in the case, and although the prostimon was to be credited to the account of the revenues collected by him and his men, the deposit slip still

1 [illegible]

needed the signature of Phibis the basilikogrammateus. Phibis, when he signed, also assumed that the local secretaries would do the same, and that they would add whatever information was pertinent. There is nothing unexpected in the branches of the Ptolemaic bureaucracy which appear here, and although the procedure of the papyrus may be rather unusual, in the end it is the usual secretaries who manage the concluding phase of the business.

The neatly delineated [illegible] the banker as the authority who decides that the [illegible] is to be deposited [illegible]. It might have been [illegible] to the other [illegible] that this was to be the destination of the 1200 drachmas [illegible] or tell Dionysius [illegible] the banker who, [illegible] came and the procedure by which [illegible] was obtained. [illegible]

[illegible]

land may by implication be expanded [illegible] similar waste land elsewhere in Ptolemaic Egypt.

[illegible] the second century B.C. [illegible] [illegible] presently.

[illegible]

[illegible] the Ptolemaic [illegible]

[illegible] of the papyri [illegible] available [illegible] The [illegible]

[illegible] possession of the [illegible]

[illegible] who purchased the property [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] The property of the [illegible] and his [illegible] was confiscated to the [illegible]

[illegible] The confiscated property was put up for sale and sold to [illegible] with [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] After the [illegible] had been [illegible] a dispute [illegible] the partners who bought the land [illegible] appealed to [illegible] the [illegible] and [illegible]

Several first century [illegible] [illegible]

The papyrus also [illegible] [illegible]

The [illegible]

[illegible]

the idios logos. No other person is called idios logos before the second century [illegible] is improbable [illegible] and there is only a Ptolemaic official called the idios logos. [illegible] would be a more likely candidate [illegible] the title ὁ πρὸς τῷ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ.

[illegible] the [illegible] for the idios logos [illegible] with this matter would be [illegible] important [illegible] of the Roman [illegible] definite conclusions [illegible].

The papyrus [illegible] late Ptolemaic Egypt [illegible] idios logos [illegible] a man of status [illegible] capital [illegible] this papyrus, however, [illegible] has always been [illegible] the [illegible] the type of [illegible].

[illegible] background [illegible] indirectly [illegible] the [illegible] property, the [illegible] should [illegible] be drawn from the evidence [illegible].

[illegible]

The appearance of an office with the title ὁ πρὸς τῷ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ in [illegible] from the papyrus, namely that the idios logos [illegible] was an important branch of the Ptolemaic [illegible]. Besides [illegible] of them have been [illegible] to the same year.[illegible]

[illegible]

Hephaestion is the best attested of the three. In addition to BGU 1772 (before [illegible] B.C.), he survives fully [illegible] in BGU 1756 and 1757 (59/58 and 52/51 B.C.) and [illegible] (May [illegible] B.C.). [illegible] was dioiketes in [illegible] B.C. (BGU 1745, 1747 [illegible]) [illegible] for Hephaestion's [illegible] dioiketes [illegible] may have been [illegible] was dependent upon the [illegible] and [illegible] have been continuous from [illegible] B.C. to 52/51 B.C.[14]

[illegible] The [illegible] Hephaestion [illegible] Add to this [illegible] first and the last [illegible] probably the immediate [illegible] Hephaestion [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] B.C. [illegible] 25, [illegible]

[illegible] suggest [illegible]

14. Hephaestion [illegible] 1756.

15. [illegible] BGU 1772 [illegible]

16. [illegible]

[illegible]

Ramses in 61/60 BC. Thus the succession of dockets and strategoi in the Medamoud-palace would be as follows:

Docket no.		Strategos	Year
Athenaios		Dionysios	64/63 BC
Nesmin(ios)	καὶ στρατ(ηγὸς) τῆς Θηβ(αΐδος)	Hephaistion	63/62 BC
Hephaistion	καὶ στρατ(ηγὸς) τῆς Θηβ(αΐδος)	Hephaistion	62/61 BC
Hephaistion		Ramses	61/60 BC

The most convenient arrangement for the three known department heads would then be as follows:

Kyrsos	70 BC
Nesmin(ios)	63/62 BC
Hephaistion (with interruption)	62/61–52 BC

The documents of P.Col. VIII demonstrate that the [illegible] during not simply a matter of [illegible] documented docket-[illegible] of the Ptolemaic-period Egyptian [illegible] from top to bottom.

[illegible] Zoilos of Aspendos [illegible] that the [illegible] but the most traditional aspects [illegible]

The Ptolemaic rulers of Egypt [illegible] their power [illegible] rights to use the king's property [illegible] their heirs [illegible] gardens [illegible]

21 The full text was published by H. Gauthier in Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte 10 (1910) pp. 177–181. As to the documents that appear in the dockets, reference [illegible] pp. 214–215.

Confiscated property which was not ready to be sold would require at least a separate administration through up-to-date records of the condition and [illegible] of each property would be needed to facilitate its sale. Auctions of [illegible] land would have to be organized and managed and the payment of [illegible] to the [illegible] would have to be supervised. It is uncertain before the date of [illegible] whether the idios logos [illegible] a separate administration [illegible] of the [illegible] dealing with confiscated property and the adespota [illegible] role played by the regular administration.

In the [illegible] century [illegible] was in charge of the idios logos. This indicates [illegible] that the idios logos [illegible] of administration in Alexandria separate [illegible] Ptolemaic bureaucracy. This requirement [illegible] becomes overloaded with confiscated property. [illegible] the government [illegible] arable, cultivated land [illegible] private property [illegible]. The greater the [illegible] the greater the opportunity for the government to [illegible] property which [illegible] be placed in the established [illegible] which had been in general [illegible] private property in late Ptolemaic Egypt [illegible] by the adespota now to be discussed.

[illegible]

The [illegible] adespota [illegible] Ptolemaic document [illegible] with the adespota [illegible] of transactions concerning adespota [illegible] to be fully explained by reference to [illegible] property. A good illustration of adespota may be found in [illegible] in the years between 168 and 158 B.C. [illegible] owned 80 arourai of land [illegible] and his wife fled during an uprising. While they were absent, at least [illegible] of the 80 arourai were placed in [illegible]. These

[illegible] ... [illegible] of the regular administration of the Thebaid.

[illegible] Wilcken [illegible] pp. [illegible] ... [illegible] 1956, pp. [illegible] The date is [illegible]

[illegible]

The [illegible] that they were or perhaps had been [illegible] were the [illegible]. The [illegible] could have been held the [illegible] from the [illegible] that [illegible] the [illegible] with [illegible] which [illegible] the [illegible] which [illegible] the [illegible] which [illegible] the

same formulaic pattern as [illegible] and *P. [illegible]*. It is more likely that payments from the property sold at auction in 145/144 B.C. were deposited to the [illegible] by the banker to whom they were sent. *P. [illegible]* 253, which is also a sale of [illegible] in 143/142 B.C., would similarly be deposited once it reached the bank.

[illegible] 220-221, which record a transaction of 150 B.C., are a good example of what [illegible] ought to have done. Hermias addressed a bid of 4000 drachmai for several parcels of land [illegible] to Dionysios [illegible]. He also requested a [illegible] that he might be able to pay the price, and [illegible] added a promise to pay the [illegible]. The bid was forwarded to the local [illegible] who raised the price [illegible] 2000 drachmai [illegible] was sold to Hermias on the [illegible] March [illegible] 220 Col. [illegible]. The payment was made in full [illegible] with the usual subscription, [illegible] of the [illegible] for deposit [illegible]. The [illegible] 221 [illegible] was [illegible]. However, the [illegible] of the [illegible] and [illegible] to *P. [illegible]* [illegible] that the price was [illegible] suggest that the [illegible] must have [illegible] on the less specific [illegible].

Hermias [illegible] what [illegible] should have done in 150 B.C. Although the land [illegible] ought to have submitted a bid [illegible] desired. Hermias had [illegible] worth 4000 drachmai. [illegible] to the relevant local [illegible] the price of the property which was valued at [illegible] drachmai. Hermias was [illegible] to pay the price for the land and it was [illegible] status of the property and the fact that it was sold [illegible] that the price was to be deposited [illegible].

[illegible] the same [illegible]. The bid [illegible] described [illegible] that he might pay the price [illegible] had done in [illegible]. The [illegible] persuaded [illegible] and [illegible] the property. The bid was received and [illegible] Adeimantos [illegible] the price [illegible] the [illegible] Adeimantos was to have [illegible] the [illegible] instructions from [illegible] for deposit of the price [illegible] bank.

[illegible]

The only evidence besides P. [illegible] for the Ptolemaic [illegible] comes from [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

the state began to include all of the unoccupied land of Egypt that the government might wish to sell, whether that land was *ager publicus*, confiscated, or simply waste land."[1]

A SUMMARY: THE PTOLEMAIC EDICTS

[illegible]

which there was no record of former ownership might never have been occupied

supervised by an official called a τοποτηρητὴς τοῦ ἴδιου λόγου, a title which is in evidence probably as early as 80 B.C. The competence and function of such an official in charge of the idios logos (as in supervising the bookkeeping involved in the recording of sales and perhaps in periodically auditing records to ensure that none of the lower officials concerned with the payments deposited to the idios logos was defrauding the crown) was

The idios logos was involved in the recording of a significant amount of income, as is evident from the transaction protocols noted as well as from P. Athen. 12. The fragmentary text, to be dated c. 100 B.C., mentions payment of some 12 talents, the source of which is not clear, to be deposited to the idios logos. The rubric of property in the public sector to which the direct evidence could easily expand the scope of such a payment to idios logos is the possibility that the acquisition also recorded deposits. Frequent references to ἄλογα γῆς increase the amount of business which would require the existence of an official in charge of the idios logos and provide a reason for the logos becoming eventually a department of the [illegible] administration.

The evidence of the mid-century BC [illegible] property [illegible] idios logos [illegible] a category of land termed the land of [illegible] an important official in charge of the idios logos [illegible] the idios logos and involved [illegible] a more bookkeeping account. Management of [illegible] property [illegible] extension of all property which was produced [illegible] an idios logos [illegible] a major department. Land and [illegible] the land of [illegible] the law of such property would [illegible] the [illegible] to suggest the existence of [illegible] that [illegible] the [illegible] nothing [illegible] property which [illegible] a deposit [illegible] the sale [illegible] property which [illegible] idios logos [illegible] from the sale [illegible] property which [illegible] idios logos.

As in the case [illegible] property [illegible] from the sale of government property [illegible] a department the functions [illegible] idios logos [illegible] the [illegible] property [illegible] some of the [illegible] which [illegible] in charge [illegible] the [illegible] questions [illegible] [illegible] a new title and [illegible] [illegible] the land [illegible] the [illegible] price deposited [illegible] idios logos and [illegible] idios logos and [illegible].

We may, therefore, discern in the documents three stages in the development of the idios logos. It was first a logos distinguished from the basilikon and established to record certain payments which were [illegible] recorded to the basilikon. A second, [illegible] stage, perhaps contemporary with the first, was the establishment in Alexandria of an office and probably an

official to look after the interests of the ideologue. This phase was accompanied by an increasing number of government sales which raised correspondingly the number of deposits to the state's gain.

Architecturally, although sales of vacant confiscated properties were credited to the ideologue's property-owning management, felt to the *bandidos*, which superseded all the procedures which normally led to the deposit to the ideologue's [illegible] stage of development, the office of the dockets maintained a separate [illegible] the ideologue itself.

[illegible] department was created when the ideologue's [illegible] of the properties whose sale price would be deposited to the ideologue's credit and the dockets would have [illegible] ideologue's property was recorded to the ideologue to be [illegible] stage of that office instead of

[illegible] to the dockets on account of the chief [illegible] to the dockets an administrator. The [illegible] of the government which prevents the [illegible] that the [illegible] purchased [illegible] the [illegible] dockets [illegible] which the [illegible] sale [illegible] B.C. [illegible] were completed.[illegible] of

whether the idios logos released the property to the basilikon prior to the sale,[47] and the basilikon itself did the selling as the document states.

Whatever be the answer to the problems raised by the statement of purchase in BGU 1772, the fact that the idios logos had some administrative control over confiscated property by 68/67 B.C. must be taken into account, as must be its corollary consequence, that the idios logos was by this time a department of the Ptolemaic financial administration. The general difficulty of BGU 1772 is in part due to the fact that the same person, Hephaistion, is named both as dioiketes and as head of the idios logos. The final point on the distinction between basilikon and idios logos and the precise history of the development of this distinction must wait until such time as the role of Hephaistion as dioiketes can be separated from that of Hephaistion as head of the idios logos.

The reason for the establishment of the idios logos is obscure. It was created to record payments received from the sale of government properties, payments that prior to BGU 1772 were deposited in the basilikon. The decision by the Ptolemaic financial administration to keep separate records of the sums gained from government property would have logically come at a time when the number of such sales had increased sufficiently to make a distinct record-keeping desirable. From the sales examined in this chapter [illegible] the growth in the quantity falling to the government from private [illegible] another, and the willingness on the part of the government to return this property through sale back to private ownership.

The documentary evidence of the idios logos [illegible] the reality of a separate account, and [illegible] logos of a separate [illegible] idios logos [illegible] Ptolemaic financial administration. [illegible] account would provide [illegible] realized from sales of government property and [illegible]

[illegible]

47. [illegible]

themselves. Without a separate logos the only convenient way for revenue from sales to be distinguished from the regular revenue deposited to the basilikon would be to abstract from the records of the basilikon all payments received for government property. Rather than have the separation take place at Alexandria, it was decided that the distinction should be made at the local bank at the moment of deposit. The government thus had readily accessible figures for the revenue provided by the sale of its property, and perhaps more importantly a key for determining the effectiveness and the speed of the return into private hands of otherwise unprofitable properties.[44]

In addition to the practical advantage of an idios logos account, there were perhaps some additional consequences of such a logos to the regular Ptolemaic finance administration. With the revenue of the sale of property falling to the government by the [illegible] of the documents to the [illegible] and [illegible]. But [illegible] to the basilikon along with the [illegible] revenues deposited would result in a rather misleading picture of the state of the regular revenues. For example the [illegible] the [illegible] deposited to the basilikon a single [illegible] payments received from the sale of government property [illegible] deposited and recorded separately. A very [illegible] would not have been accurately [illegible]. On the other hand, the [illegible] decline [illegible] deposited in the basilikon [illegible] the decline of such revenue. The fact that private [illegible] from whom some of the revenue for the basilikon was collected were abandoning [illegible] their property could not be entirely concealed. A separate account [illegible] however would solve

[illegible]

the dioikeses in the bureaucratic hierarchy.[illegible]

In the final analysis the Ptolemaic idios logos was a bureaucratic necessity. There may be an inclination to see the department as the agent which implemented a more liberal attitude on the part of the government in regard to private property. [illegible] land, [illegible] confiscated or abandoned private property was being sold. The motivation was provided not by enlightened [illegible] but by fiscal practicality. Sale of government property was a source of immediate cash revenue and of immediate cultivation for otherwise unproductive property.

A date for the establishment of the idios logos cannot be exactly determined. Presumably it came at a time when the [illegible] of private property during the [illegible] second century B.C. necessitated a separate account for recording [illegible] abandoned property. It must have come at a time when [illegible] were being deprived of their possessions and a host of [illegible]. Perhaps a [illegible] at the Bank in [illegible] instructing that all payments from the [illegible] property be deposited to the idios logos [illegible].

[illegible] between [illegible] B.C. and the date [illegible] 177 [illegible] the idios logos. We may [illegible] when [illegible] the idios logos was [illegible].

[illegible] property [illegible] the Ptolemaic bureaucracy [illegible] the idios logos was [illegible] to play [illegible] in the [illegible] administration of Egypt.[illegible]

[illegible]

Chapter Two

The Julio-Claudian Idios Logos

I. SATANAES SON OF HERODES, NESTNUBIS SON OF TESES AND [illegible]

[illegible]

1. [illegible]
2. [illegible]
3. [illegible]
4. [illegible]
5. [illegible]
6. [illegible]

A.D. [illegible]

[illegible] statement [illegible]

[illegible] Rufus, before [illegible]

[illegible] A.D. 35.

[illegible] of the above.

[illegible] the original [illegible]

[illegible] Rufus, be-[illegible] A.D. 35.

[illegible] A.D. 36.

[illegible] of the above.

[illegible] October [illegible] A.D. 37.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] probably [illegible] in the past [illegible] there may have been some sort of

letter, however, he apparently began to have some doubts about the existence of evidence to prove this important point, or else he was unwilling to perjure himself by referring to documents which he, after some preliminary investigation on his own, knew did not exist. For such other reasons he [illegible] references to the nature of Chaeremon's [illegible] of the [illegible] (ll. 13). With the documentary evidence for his case slowly sliding into uncertainty, Sarapion summed up his personal frustration: he had made improvements on the [illegible] but the bureaucratic machinery had been turned against him; he had been summoned to Alexandria to save his [illegible]. His last request was [illegible], i.e., "that my name be recorded in the minutes of the dialogismos [illegible]."

Sarapion never [illegible] at the hearing of the dialogismos. Xenotrophus did. He testified that a search [illegible] showed that the sale of year 40 had not been registered (SB [illegible]). There is evidence that Seppius Rufus had at the time of the dialogismos [illegible] statement of Xenotrophus and the [illegible] of Sarapion [illegible] Sarapion who, after all, did claim to have documents to prove [illegible] against him and who was involved in a personal feud with Xenotrophus, Seppius Rufus decided to institute an investigation [illegible] and require Sarapion to establish his point.

Accordingly, after [illegible] and 27th [illegible] (SB 5954), Asklepiades the basilikogrammateus [illegible] to the [illegible] copies of the [illegible] as parts in the investigation. The results of the [illegible] were to be used as evidence at the next dialogismos. [illegible] to send for Sarapion and have him produce his documents [illegible].

Apparently the [illegible], who were [illegible] to provide the testimony that [illegible] Sarapion had either been consulted by or had contacted Rufus before the decision [illegible] one of the copies from the later hearing [illegible] Rufus is quoted as saying in reference to this [illegible] [illegible] (SB [illegible]).

Sarapion, who probably fully realized by this time that there were no documents to prove Chaeremon's title to the property, attempted to take advantage of the irregularities discovered by Xenotrophus, the non-registration of the sale of year 41, and the nature of the charge against him as it appeared in the eyes of Seppius Rufus. [illegible] Rufus had made it quite clear in his letters to the centurion and the basilikogrammateus that the case against Sarapion as far as he was concerned was that he had [illegible] [illegible] (SB 5954 [illegible], SB 5239 [illegible]). Sarapion would have to prove both that he had not added [illegible] to his property, and also that the land had never been [illegible]. His only hope for victory was to have Rufus investigate not

whether the lots were [illegible], but whether or not they had been purchased in year 41 rather than merely having been added to his property in year 40 without benefit of purchase. For the former question [illegible]; for the latter, even though the sale had not been registered, he [illegible] own record of the sale. He must have had at least one copy of the deed. We have three.

With righteous indignation he [illegible] and [illegible] to Rufus, probably as soon as he learned of the decision [illegible] but certainly before the end of the [illegible] February [illegible]. He summed up the case as far as it had developed at the time he was writing, [illegible] the [illegible] which were the subject of the dispute were part of the property that had been sold to him by [illegible] 24 [illegible] year 13 [illegible] that the sale had been registered [illegible] were the recorders and [illegible] were witnesses [illegible]

[illegible]

make the identification with the [illegible] quite certain. Nestnephis stated in his [illegible] that [illegible] had purchased [illegible] house from the [illegible] and [illegible] vacant lots which [illegible]. Nestnephis admitted that there was a sale but distinguished between the house which [illegible] purchased and the vacant lots which [illegible]. In both cases, he asserted, the property was [illegible]

By the [illegible] of the [illegible], that [illegible] the second year of Tiberius, and perhaps [illegible] purchased the property, at [illegible] of the hearing before Seppius Rufus [illegible] relevance [illegible] of the property. [illegible] that Rufus did not mention any [illegible] he summed up the case before issuing his final [illegible]

Seppius Rufus [illegible] all the presbyteroi [illegible] were never presented to [illegible] the vacant lots [illegible] in the deeds were [illegible] appurtenances that he had sold to [illegible] belonged to his [illegible] Nestnephis swore to the contrary [illegible] property [illegible] belonged [illegible] and [illegible]

[illegible] the house was not substantiated [illegible] who had been interviewed at the [illegible] the vacant lots Rufus decided to put [illegible] There- fore Seppius Rufus [illegible] (P. Amh. 155.11 [II, p. 279]).

[illegible] were rather similar to those of [illegible] He had [illegible] to purchase the [illegible] from the government before he had occupied them. The fact that he did not realize that the vacant lots were [illegible] He should have made an offer for them in the [illegible] very much in the manner that Nestnephis had for them in the year 45.[8]

[illegible]

[illegible] near the time of the Theban [illegible] that the [illegible] he would have been [illegible] the proper [illegible] property [illegible]

The payment [illegible] certificate. [illegible] If there was an analogy in the Satabous affair with the payment [illegible] then we might expect that the 500 drachmas to be paid to Satabous was a base sum and a sales price in view of the provisions of the Petronian decree. That sum represents the estimated value of the vacant site as opposed to Satabous' increased by 200 drachmas would be for the property and the 300 additional drachmas would be a compensation for the value which was found to have accrued [illegible] Satabous would have paid for the vacant site 2 and 1/2 times the estimated price of the land [illegible] Satabous would have paid 5 and 2/3 the estimated price in total.

The use of the complex vocabulary of [illegible] the [illegible] Satabous' [illegible] payment [illegible] Satabous would have received [illegible] case according to the provisions of the decree. The [illegible] depended on the [illegible] and the [illegible] Satabous paid through the [illegible] the [illegible]

Satabous [illegible] with [illegible] 8 [illegible] that [illegible] the [illegible] house which Satabous had purchased in A.D. 11 and which Rufus had wished to [illegible]. Satabous would again be [illegible] the [illegible] without benefit of purchase to [illegible] As the [illegible] would be [illegible] this time in terms of a payment [illegible] It is suggested above such a payment was [illegible] price like the Petronian provision granted in such cases the amount would be the value of the house as estimated by Stenophes increased by 200 [illegible]

That Satabous had fought the [illegible] was of no relevance to Petronius when he passed judgment. Nevertheless, which he had twice admitted to Rufus, the letters he had sent [illegible] improvement of the property, was also [illegible] The investigation initiated by Rufus probably considered three questions: 1 were the [illegible] failing to

[illegible] of waste [illegible] The [illegible] Satabous had [illegible] [illegible] Petronius [illegible] [illegible] Satabous [illegible] [illegible] Petronius payment [illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] idios logos, 2) if so, were they purchased from the idios logos, 3) if so, were they purchased by Satabous or Chaeremon? The answer to the first question was affirmative, to the second, negative. Therefore, Satabous, since he had freely admitted that he was occupying the lots, was guilty. [illegible] that none of the documents clearly states the exact nature of his delict. He was not convicted on the charge that Nestnephis had originally brought against him, adding ownerless vacant lots to his property, since the decision [illegible] referred to the lots as the lots which Satabous had purchased.

His delict was one of negligence. He had failed to verify Chaeremon's title to the property. He would have been better off if he had in fact illegally occupied the property. When Nestnephis sent an information to the authorities, he could then simply have abandoned the property. However, under the misapprehension that he owned them [illegible], he admitted that he had occupied them since A.D. 11. Thus his own admission was the primary evidence of his guilt, and because he had paid for the lots in A.D. 11, he had to pay for them again in A.D. 16.

There is no indication that Chaeremon was to be called to account, even though he had testified on Satabous' behalf. If Satabous was guilty of illegally occupying property belonging to the idios logos, Chaeremon was guilty of illegally selling the same property. Whether or not such matters were within the competence of the idios logos in A.D. 16 is not readily discernible from present evidence.[13] All [illegible] who would pay for the [illegible]. The matter of the [illegible], as far as the idios logos was concerned, was closed in A.D. 16, although Satabous could bring [illegible] against the [illegible]. That, however, is [illegible].

It is [illegible] that the Augustan idios logos was involved in the administration of the [illegible], which had been important to the idios logos since the [illegible]. The [illegible], which had become a separate department [illegible] administration [illegible] as a department under the Roman administration. It was within the competence of this department that the case of Satabous fell. The papyri we have just examined define the department's [illegible] the [illegible] the department [illegible] when they were to be sold [illegible]. The Satabous affair developed within this framework.

The papyri reveal more about the [illegible] of the department than that the Ptolemaic evidence. They [illegible] document the important role that the head of the department played in [illegible] matters that were investigated primarily by local officials. The only Ptolemaic evidence for the personal intervention of the head of the department in administrative

13. [illegible]

matters in BGU 1773 where, however, it is impossible to distinguish Hephaistion's role as dioiketes from his role as head of the idios logos.

The department's involvement in the [illegible] began when [illegible] sent information against Satabous to Asklepiades the basilikogrammateus. Satabous saw this in SB 5232 as equivalent to informing directly the head of the idios logos. There was really little [illegible] [illegible] if the business had never proceeded beyond the [illegible] and the [illegible] officials, the local officials would still have been working under the [illegible] of the department in Alexandria. Once the head of the department [illegible] directly concerned, his functions were [illegible] by his [illegible] investigating the matter, locating the culprits, and [illegible] a proper [illegible]. Although the department appeared to have the [illegible] for discovering and finding the [illegible], it could not [illegible] anything but administrative jurisdiction [illegible] that he had [illegible] Satabous the property which [illegible] belonged to the government. In reality [illegible] was guilty. A judgment against [illegible] by the head of the department was in A.D. 56 apparently not the concern of the idios logos.

[illegible]

The Satabous papers illustrate the role of the idios logos as investigator and judge in cases involving property [illegible]. Several [illegible] documents from [illegible] bring to light a few more [illegible] of the department and its head. [illegible] Augustus, February [illegible] A.D. [illegible] Attius [illegible] [illegible] which he [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] He included a detailed list of the [illegible] value and location of each piece of [illegible].

1. [illegible] in the [illegible] of [illegible] Dionysius [illegible] drachmas.

2. [illegible] in the temple of [illegible] 2 branches [illegible]

3. [illegible] in the [illegible] temple of Ammon [illegible]

4. [illegible] in the [illegible] drachmas, total [illegible] drachmas.

He concluded with a request that [illegible]

[illegible]

day. There is no reason to retain any special explanation for the rapid processing of the document. It was probably due to the combination of the proximity of Flaccus and his staff, and the efficiency inspired by a high official from Alexandria. It is interesting that, although the Greek grammateus stated in his letter that the matter concerned the night just past, there was a 15-day delay between the date of Dionysodorus' letter and the letter written by the 3 grammateis. The presence of Flaccus was of more importance to speed than location.

The papyrus further bespeaks an established routine familiar to the bidder and to the officials who were responsible for processing it. Dionysodorus and probably any interested party knew that adoptees were to be presented formally at the logeion. He knew also that bids for adoptees would be given priority by the head of the department. He had no doubt also learned of the presence of Isarion. The details which were mentioned in the bid—the exact number, weight and location of the bundles and the reference to a contract which apparently regulated certain aspects of the administration of the adoptees—bear witness to a familiarity on the part of Dionysodorus with the business at hand. Such a familiarity gained either from personal experience or from advance information published by the various officials involved—perhaps even of the adoptees in question who were advertised for sale.[51]

That the local and minor officials were equally familiar with their duties is also apparent. Despite the fact that the office was abolished, several days in the wake of the revolution, the Greek grammateus, with a great sense of responsibility, knew exactly what duties to perform and to whom to report. He knew also that Dionysodorus would require only what was necessary to make a determination. He knew that the bid was rejected and left the office. Apparently the grammateus made sure that it had been handled properly. A [illegible] was delayed for 15 days before the 3 grammateis were ready. It was the grammateus who were to gather all the information. The prologos requested by Dionysodorus was expanded by the Greek grammateus to determine that the bundles were to go to each location. They were also to see whether the wood was dry. A determination was then made whether each piece was [illegible]. A determination whether the wood was [illegible] appropriate to the adoptee's age according to the custom. A [illegible] that the price value of the wood (15 Dr. per cubic cubit) was accomplished. It also was [illegible] stated, the information would return by the same channels to the sovereign who, when [illegible] would give him the go-per [illegible].

The procedure whereby [illegible] is necessary calling immediately to mind the second century synagogue of the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati. From the corner in which it occurs in Philo [illegible] was involved to determine whether articles were [illegible] across

51. The procedure for the confiscation of a Roman citizen's estate is clear. It is where, however, there is no evidence of an official in charge of the affairs of a department of state [illegible]

[illegible]. This may imply that it either included criteria to be used in determining whether something was adespota or listed certain adespota which were to be appropriated by the [illegible]. In either case it would have been a document which contained a certain amount of detail. The gnomon was known both to the [illegible] and the hierogrammateis would need a copy of it since they were expected to answer certain questions in reference to it [illegible] and to the prospective buyer who realized that it was of some importance to the adespota which he wanted to purchase. It is impossible, however, to say whether the [illegible] of the gnomon was from first hand knowledge of it or from a published [illegible] for the purchase of adespota.

The [illegible] and branches would tend to give the term adespota when applied to [illegible] branches a rather broad definition, perhaps [illegible] ecclesiastical and the fourth to the [illegible] Melanthios [illegible] that [illegible] from a [illegible] these temple properties [illegible] asserting that Melanthios was not still occupying his property because [illegible] adespota and was liable to appropriation by the [illegible]. [illegible] could not be removed from the place where it [illegible] had been duly purchased from the idios logos. The branch was [illegible].

If Dubs[illegible] had [illegible] them from some one other than the [illegible] that they were ownerless, he would have been exposed to [illegible] that were to [illegible]. By the same token [illegible] of his vacant lots, he [illegible] sending to the head of the idios logos [illegible] to the [illegible] Dubs[illegible].

In [illegible] a hypomnema addressed [illegible] and passed on by him [illegible] the idios logos [illegible]. The author of [illegible] from the idios logos [illegible]. This would be [illegible] with the terms of the hypomnema [illegible] to the purchase of adespota. [illegible] Serapion could have done. The [illegible] were within the [illegible] had to be purchased from that department.

[illegible] He received the bid [illegible]. He [illegible] from the [illegible] deposits [illegible] adespota [illegible] in Medum [illegible] a few dried [illegible] and some vacant lots

Part of his business did involve supervising the sale of whatever *adespota* were liable to appropriation by the idios logos in the Oxyrhynchite Nome. This might entail advertising the *adespota* known to the local secretaries and perhaps organising auctions, although none are attested. From the two papyri that concern Fronto it is probable that at least a form to be used in applying for purchase was published. Such a form might have accompanied a list of properties being sold from the idios logos.

More importantly, we see that the head of the idios logos, perhaps as part of a regular routine at the start of the administrative year, was touring the nomes to investigate at first hand whether or not [illegible] were being discovered and properly recorded. This would have been no easy task in the case of [illegible] seems to have found [illegible]. As [illegible] the head of the idios logos [illegible] *adespota* and [illegible] should fall to the idios logos would appear at least temporarily [illegible].

Fronto may also have been personally supervising the investigation of cases involving the illegal occupation of *adespota* property before the idios logos. In brief, we should expect that he was [illegible] A.D. [illegible] the date of the text, had been allocated to the department managing and selling the *adespota* which were appropriated to the idios logos and investigating and judging cases of irregularities involving these same *adespota*.

The sale of [illegible] may be added to this list of items that concern the idios logos and its chief secretary. [illegible] is another example of a bid addressed to the head of the idios logos, in this instance [illegible] Seppius Rufus, who directed the investigation and passed final judgement in the [illegible] affair and who [illegible] A.D. 15. Since the two petitioners [illegible] the [illegible] year of Augustus it is clear that they had [illegible] year. The pair wanted [illegible]

The [illegible] which they wanted to buy were in three groups:

1. [illegible] that had been confiscated in year [illegible] of Augustus and which had subsequently been [illegible].
2. [illegible] that had been confiscated in year [illegible].
3. [illegible] confiscated that same year.

[illegible]

Roberts and Skeat have constructed a reasonable history for these klēroi.[illegible] For some unknown reason the land was confiscated [illegible] during the [illegible] year of Augustus [illegible] became royal land. Following [illegible] the klēroi [illegible] and were assigned to a special category, [illegible] [illegible] the problem raised by the [illegible] in the bid, we may imagine [illegible] that is, the klēroi were royal land in [illegible]

The important point [illegible] that, according to Roberts and Skeat, the klēroi cannot be thought of as [illegible] property if they are royal land. This fact is relevant [illegible] the connection between the [illegible] and [illegible]. There is [illegible] point of [illegible] to purchase land [illegible] At least [illegible] who was [illegible] in A.D. [illegible] [illegible] Fronto [illegible] however, that such [illegible] were properly [illegible] and that such land was within the administration of the department.

Roberts and Skeat [illegible] and point out that [illegible] could not [illegible] were used. If the purchase was [illegible] we might consider the transaction [illegible] a formula [illegible] was involved in the sale of the klēroi [illegible] directly to be examined, will [illegible]

In [illegible] that [illegible] was anything but that [illegible] The petitioners accordingly [illegible] their formal bid by [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] The papyrus breaks off at this point. There is no reason why the bid would not have been processed in the same manner as those submitted to Fronto.

[illegible] must have been close at hand, for the offer is addressed directly to him. We may assume that he was at the time of the bid on an administrative tour of the nomes similar to the inspection that had brought Fronto to the Oxyrhynchite Nome in February of the previous year.[illegible]

[illegible]

The form of the offer from Peterson and Archdale points to some sort of public notice listing essential information that would be of interest to a prospective buyer, such as location, condition, and terms of sale. The two petitioners were familiar with such information. An advertisement would not necessarily give the history of the property offered for sale, unless it affected the attractiveness of the land. Hence no details would be given about when the land was confiscated or when it became derelict. Consequently, the two men, not knowing these details, left blank those places in their offer where such information, perhaps necessary for rational sale, should have been given. Sandwith was the job of the local surveyors to supply the missing dates. Robert and his associates were unable to fill in the blanks and so the bid that was sent to London was never supplied with the missing dates.

In another Petersen rental with similar wording, the complete history of the property we would have a stronger argument for explaining the department's role as only that of a sales agent. The property, parcel of land to be divided and disposed of, was in poor condition and of small size. The terse dates are significant. Neither Archdale's agents on 27 May 1697 and 1722, indicate that the petitioners were aware of the land's derelict condition as follows. The bid submitted to Petersen left no room for additional information upon which the bidders did not have it. Petersen and Archdale knew that the money which they bound had been or ought to have been appropriated to the ultimate legatees, which is why they would have no reason to add any additional details in their description of the property. They did not own it, however, and presumably the way of the law, the department of the Treasury would have control over private property.

A few more details about the sale of private property in Lahore Lahore made available by the records of Lands, Inv. No. 124, which was composed of Memos from the Petitioners of Secretaries, July 29, A.D. 1817. An application was given to Lieutenant Governor Sir Henry Lawrence, by a certain Hindu who wished to purchase the property. Since 1757. The application was presented to the Lahore Secretary on the 3rd of May 1856, and probably also 27 May 1721. In Parish of Assessment 3rd of the Secretary 18 Dec, from there to the Lahore Secretary on Dec. 26, 1715, there to the appropriate to Lahore Secretary on Dec. 26, 1715, where on the next day, passed it on to the Lahore Secretary 1715. The Lahore Secretary gathered the opinions from experts in the records and we have reports on May 1, 1715.

The property that Petersen and Archdale were to sell consisted of P. Day 7 St. consisted of three which had been confiscated and had subsequently become derelict and unproductive. The condition of the sale remained the same. upon payment of the stipulated price, Petersen would release the land free of

... The ... of ... in the ... of 1650 which was purchased by ... from ... Petersen, who ... the land to ...

tases for the next three years. The discrepancies in the content of the two bids are that Theokritos sent his to the strategos and that the prefect, Julius Vestinus, is mentioned in the later hypomnema as the authority who established the quoted rate of 20 drachmas per aroura (lines 20–21).

The local secretaries were to establish (1) whether the klēroi were ἀπὸ [τῶν] [illegible] (2) [illegible] ἐπὶ [illegible]; (3) whether the property was truly dry and when it had become so; (4) whether the land was ready to be sown; (5) whether the measurements had altered because of a change in the river; (6) whether the petitioner was acting for himself or for someone else; (7) the measurements of the land in question.

The idios logos is nowhere mentioned. There is a lacuna in the text at the point at which Theokritos made known from whom he thought he was buying the property (line 17). [illegible] are correct in reading [illegible] (P. Lond. Inv. 1571) [illegible] of the idios logos is to be expected, since the purchase was from the demosion. There is no reason to deny that the idios logos had some role in this sale, and that if the head of the department were in the vicinity the hypomnema would have been addressed to him. In fact, none of the sales and [illegible] mention the idios logos by name. It is only because P. [illegible] was addressed to [illegible] Seppius Rufus, who is known from the Satabous affair to have been in charge of the idios logos, that we have evidence for the department's involvement in such sales. P. Amh. 68 does not contradict this conclusion, but neither does it expand the department's role beyond what we have established from the other [illegible] sales. In its full form the processing of Theokritos' hypomnema reflected ample opportunity for allowing for any administrative control that the idios logos could not have had over such property other than that of sales agent. Part of the investigation that preceded a sale of adespota involved a check as to whether or not the property put up for sale was within the competence of the department. There was, furthermore, never any question about whether or not the offered property was capable of being sown. The investigation in P. Amh. 68 was concerned primarily with the question whether or not the klēroi were released for sale and whether it was [illegible].

It seems reasonable to suppose that γῆ ἐν ὑπολόγῳ was not within the administrative competence of the idios logos in the same way as the adespota. The administration of the latter would be concerned with [illegible] locating, listing and selling ownerless property. The former would not have to be located [illegible]; it was state land that had become barren and dry. It was presumably placed at the disposal of the authority in charge of [illegible]. That [illegible] that the authority was the idios logos. It had [illegible]. Again [illegible] was the department's decision. It was the prefect who determined the price. When, however, it came time for the actual sale, the idios logos apparently was that department which for over a century had been selling property, especially government property. The department would have acquired in connection with land in this category those same broad powers which it had exercised in the Satabous affair. The

function to track down and hear the case of anyone involved in the irregular sale of property which was to be held through the agency of the developer.

This distinction between the full administration of the property from the moment any property could be considered and the subsequent role in the case of [illegible] is the manner in which land was considered for sale is an important one, and one which is relevant to a further investigation of the early manifestations of the department's claim to ecclesiastical matters.[1]

[illegible]

The role of the [illegible] in temple affairs emerged as a prominent feature of the office in the second [illegible]. While [illegible] the [illegible] in the third century was [illegible] was generally accepted before the [illegible] and was, of course, [illegible] paragraph [illegible] of that document. Nevertheless all [illegible] which administers the department [illegible] practice and [illegible] the [illegible] and the last [illegible] documents will be found in the [illegible] the part of the [illegible] may be explained [illegible] adopted and [illegible].

[illegible] became head [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] from Nebuchadnezzar [illegible] which [illegible] plans. [illegible] support [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible] find the [illegible] papyrus states that [illegible] statement of the [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] In the second century the department would have been the sales agent for the two offices and would have supervised the payment of the installments [illegible] is an example of a [illegible] addressed to the head of the idios logos in which the holder clearly stated what he expected from the office after he was granted [illegible] the heirs and assigns would [illegible] installment fee much lower than the [illegible] qualified person. [illegible] the prices that [illegible] the offices for the installation fees totaling [illegible] the installation fee and must have [illegible] of the purchase. The charter was already [illegible] which may have been a more general [illegible] were purchased for three [illegible] the payment of an installment [illegible] the prophetes and [illegible] drachmae for the [illegible] the [illegible] trust status, the [illegible] was [illegible] drachmae [illegible] to be deposited to the department as was stated by [illegible] in the second century [illegible] were not [illegible] the [illegible] would [illegible] order [illegible] the first step [illegible] prophetes [illegible] the installation fee to the department was [illegible] The text is [illegible] that the idios logos was connected with the [illegible] and was, therefore, simultaneously engaged in [illegible]

[illegible] The [illegible] was referred [illegible] this complicates matters even further [illegible] records of Soknebtunis [illegible] who was [illegible] years old and [illegible] who was among [illegible] The [illegible] the 14th year, the date of the [illegible] The [illegible] was both a religious and financial matter involving the payment of [illegible] drachmae. Thus the two officials, Servianus Severus and [illegible], were not necessarily performing an ecclesiastical

function as high priest or representative of the high priest, but might very well have been certifying the registrations after the payment of the registration fees. The prepositional construction [illegible] has to be [illegible] translated by the editors. On the [illegible] it may depend on the verb and, hence, be translated "who was registered before Severus [illegible]."

The two officials held the same office, but since they were listed for the same year of Claudius, the office must have changed hands at some point before the Egyptian year ended. Perhaps the elder of the two priests was registered before Severus during the autumn of 41 and the younger priest was registered during 43 before [illegible] Balbus. If the [illegible] in line 27 can be read as a sigma, then [illegible] Balbus becomes Tiberius Balbus, whom we have assumed to have been head of the idios logos in July of 43 and [illegible] the ecclesiastical epikrisis. And, of course, Severus becomes another name to be added to the list of those who held the [illegible] under the Julio-Claudians.

The role of the idios logos in temple matters, if such there was, does not imply that the department had usurped a prerogative of the high priest. An analogy can, perhaps, be drawn to the [illegible] role as sales agent for [illegible] property which was [illegible] to the idios logos [illegible] for sale. Similarly, it was sales agent for the offices which it was selling, or for the [illegible] of which it was supervising the deposit of the installment fee, and perhaps certifying the [illegible] until they were [illegible] and ready for resale or reoccupation by a legitimate successor to the deceased or delinquent office holder. The idios logos was also [illegible] for [illegible] government property and for [illegible] government [illegible] such as temple [illegible].

Its connection with the [illegible] of [illegible] these [illegible] is less understandable. However, we may have to [illegible] the fact that registration was a source of [illegible], irregular income, and that the epikrisis may have been a necessary condition for the assumption of all the ecclesiastical positions sold through the idios logos.

The above conclusions are extremely tentative. Nevertheless, they provide a Julio-Claudian basis for the department's [illegible] complicated involvement in temple affairs, an involvement that [illegible] was fully developed by A.D. 150. It is quite possible that the role [illegible] as sales agent for temple positions and the subordinate function of investigating and [illegible] cases that affected that role did not originate with [illegible] but that [illegible] was a part of the Julio-Claudian idios logos' connection with non-productive [illegible].

17. [illegible] p. [illegible] listed Severus as head of the idios logos and [illegible] [illegible] as [illegible]. They [illegible], however, [illegible] the [illegible] the other. They are [illegible] both [illegible] head [illegible].

[illegible] THE EDICT OF [illegible] ALEXANDER AND THE EDICT OF CN. VERGILIUS CAPITO

The documents in this section add few details to the picture of the administration of the idios logos but do afford a more general view of the department's position in the bureaucratic structure of Julio-Claudian Egypt. P. Fouad 21, September 4, A.D. 63, appears at first glance to be more significant for the history of the department's development than actually is the case. The text is a copy of an hypomnematismos, the minutes of a hearing held pro tribunali during which were present in council:

Norbanus Ptolemaeus, juridicus and ὁ πρὸς τῷ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ,
Avilius Quadratus and Tennius Verus
[illegible] Atticus
Papirius Rufus and Marius [illegible]
Julius Lysimachus, Claudius Heraclides, [illegible]
[illegible] Secundus

The hearing concerned the [illegible] and might have pointed to an important [illegible] head of the idios logos in such matters if the [illegible] in this case had been given [illegible] Norbanus [illegible] (1935), pp. 11-49, which [illegible] a hearing on a similar matter before the same board [illegible] September [illegible] however, that the prefect of [illegible] spoke the [illegible] in the second case. [illegible] P. Fouad 21. Although the [illegible] papers [illegible] expand the [illegible] of the idios logos [illegible] that the head of the department [illegible]

The [illegible] of Norbanus [illegible] with the [illegible] which Strabo had arranged his [illegible] important [illegible] in Egypt. [illegible] that [illegible] the head of the idios logos was also [illegible] [illegible] Whether this [illegible] 63 [illegible] whether it ever extended [illegible] the combination of the idios logos with any other office such as the high priesthood [illegible]

[illegible] P. Fouad 21 in that it appears [illegible] understanding of the [illegible] idios logos. The clause relating to the department reads [illegible] τοῦ ἰδίου λόγου [illegible] ἰδίου λόγου [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ἀπαιτος . . . . Meautis offers the following translation: ". . . and if anyone be unreasonably burdened by taxes exacted by the idiologos or by any other tax agent . . . ,"[25] implying both that the title designated an individual and that the holder of the office was a tax agent, praktor. But the individuality of the idiologos is merely assumed[26] and the Greek does not imply that the idiologos was a praktor, as the translation "other tax agent" suggests.[27] There is no basis either in this or in any other first-century text for linking the department with the praktores.[28]

The two prefectorial edicts offer an even broader perspective of the impact that the department had made upon the populace and allow more room for speculation. The later of the two, since it is in a better state of preservation and hence more amenable to interpretation, will be considered first. The edict of Ti. Julius Alexander (? July 6, A.D. 68), in general, concerned the abuses that ran rampant through the prefecture of his predecessor, C. Caecina Tuscus. Problems pertinent to the idiologos, lines 39–45, followed directly upon a statement by Alexander about instances of double jeopardy in the prefect's dialogismos. He continued in line 39: "The same I order concerning those brought before the idiologos." He went on to recite some of the more obvious abuses in the administration of that department. Briefly, these were the major items:

1. matters dismissed by the ἐπὶ τοῦ ἰδίου λόγου τεταγμένοι had been brought up again.
2. defendants who had received a favorable decision had been reprosecuted.
3. some delators were not even appearing in person to prosecute suits that they had instigated but were being advocated by others.
4. furthermore, some prosecutors were pressing suits repeatedly until they obtained a verdict against the defendant.
5. lastly, certain extrapolations had been made in the gnomon of the idios logos contrary to the grants of the emperors.

The abuses which Alexander described were of two sorts: those perpetrated

23. [illegible] the Roman Imperial [illegible] Alexandrinorum [illegible]

24. The [illegible] permanently in the first [illegible] of the first century [illegible] degree [illegible] department [illegible]

27. The [illegible] "the rest of [illegible]"

28. [illegible]

[illegible]

29. [illegible]

by prosecutors conducting cases before the *idios logos* and those engendered by emendations in the *gnomon*. The former went hand in hand with the irregularities that Alexander had previously mentioned in reference to the prefect's *dialogismos*. He attempted to correct these abuses with several [illegible]:

a. In reference to 1 and 2 above, [illegible] who in the future prosecuted [illegible] a matter that had been dismissed or decided would be [illegible] punished.

b. As a precaution against 3 above, no one might prosecute through an advocate without being present in person.

c. To correct the fourth abuse, [illegible] prosecuted three times without obtaining a [illegible] half of his property would be confiscated.

The situation is not surprising. It represents the Sukophant-Nesteaphis encountered in a great [illegible] the [illegible] in the [illegible] of *adespota* provided a [illegible] for personal [illegible] and perhaps for personal aggrandizement. Although there is no explicit evidence that a fixed percentage of any [illegible] was awarded to the successful prosecutor in the *idios logos* during the [illegible] of the *delatores* seems to indicate that there may well have been such a system. That there were Sukophants in abundance is equally [illegible] [illegible] so numerous that the [illegible] is all but [illegible].

The [illegible] Alexander's statements is more difficult to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] When I have [illegible] the [illegible] I shall order that the *gnomon* of the *idios logos* [illegible] [illegible] the reading and translation [illegible] to be understood for the *idios logos*. From what we have seen of these references to the *gnomon* in the [illegible] documents it is [illegible] which it was [illegible] by [illegible] [illegible] References in the *gnomon* to [illegible] property was to be determined as *adespota* [illegible] the [illegible] broadened the definition of *adespota* property liable to appropriation by the *idios logos*, that would be [illegible] and would have property [illegible] exposed to an even wider variety of [illegible] This would have increased the number of *delatores* who were prosecuting their private enemies or nourishing their personal

50. The [illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Sukophant and Nesteaphis which may be seen as an [illegible] of [illegible] in the department.

51. [illegible]

formulae. An innovation of this sort might account for the abuses listed by Alexander for cases brought before the tribunals.

But, the innovations which Alexander believed were specifically contrary to imperial "grants". What "grants" had a bearing on the disputes at this locus is not clear. The opening paragraph of the document of the Alban Forum devoted a great deal of attention to the status of various farms and their legal rights to inherit. The arbitrary [illegible] such rights would mean the eventual loss of inheritance by redefining the amount of property that heirs in certain classes might inherit. If such hereditary rights were [illegible] by general or specific charter of the emperors then any innovation the [illegible] which expanded the definition of inheritance at the expense of those rights would be considered [illegible]

Whatever the specific nature of the abuse, Alexander's motivation is a little clearer, although a little difficult to understand. The purpose of steps by which he succeeded in [illegible] the innovations. After making the corrections he would then order that the property be [illegible]. This is how it is in the present but not as made the necessary [illegible] had to wait until a proper [illegible] under the immediate [illegible] of the Lateran Forum. Apparently the [illegible] concerning the abuses by [illegible] had been [illegible] before the [illegible] justice, and a future audience [illegible] the problem essentially had the petitioners [illegible] the proper [illegible] These innovations must have been [illegible] Nevertheless [illegible] these [illegible] [illegible] implemented the [illegible] After all he had [illegible] section of the edict he [illegible] "whatever I could" concerning the properties [illegible]

Perhaps the [illegible] simply be taken to imply that it was not the [illegible] to order the [illegible] grants and that they would be [illegible] However, more subtle [illegible] were the powers granted elsewhere and that likewise the [illegible] to Rome and the Patrimony [illegible] "recommend" the acceptance of [illegible] [illegible] to the Lateran [illegible] the middle of autumn is usually [illegible] Under the hypothesis it would follow that Nero altered the powers [illegible] and that the changes would be put into effect only with the approval of the new Senators, hence the delay.

[illegible]

Because of our lack of specific knowledge about the changed gnomon and the reason for Alexander's use of the future of the verb in his corrective injunction, the edict does not allow us to come to any firm conclusion about the relation of princeps and prefect to the gnomon and, more particularly, the relation of each to the idios logos. For, if the prefect was required to obtain approval from Rome for his corrections of the gnomon, we might assume that he stood, at least in this case, only as liaison between Rome and the department of idios logos in respect to the gnomon. If the future verb was dictated simply by press of work and want of time to scrutinize the innovations as carefully as he desired, he then stood as final authority over the gnomon and in this same respect over the idios logos. Without the statement on correcting the gnomon the edict extends the authority of the prefect merely over procedural matters in the dialogismos. With the statement, the edict may imply either that the prefect controlled the whole or part of the gnomon or else that neither prefect nor department head could touch any aspect of the gnomon without permission from Rome.

The edict of Cn. Vergilius Capito, dated December 7, 48, opened with a reprimand and general pronouncement against those civil and military authorities who had illegally exacted requisitions for expenses. Any local official who felt that his office had been unjustly imposed upon was to file notice of the illegal exactions at the [illegible] and with the expenses [illegible] within 60 days (those in the [illegible] Thebaid), and send his [illegible] so that the abuses might be rectified (lines [illegible]).

The case of the nome[11] [illegible]. In the next section of the edict, the prefect discussed abuses that [illegible] administrative [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] documents], [illegible]. His concluding injunction was aimed at expediting the [illegible] at the dialogismos of those guilty of [illegible] misconduct.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

11 [illegible], op. cit., No. [illegible]; P. Jouguet, Atti del IV Congresso internazionale di Papirologia, Milano, 1936, pp. [illegible]

The inscription raises the question of the role which the department of idios logos had in cases of administrative misconduct. As has been noted several times, the department functioned in the nomes through the regular bureaucracy, these being the officials responsible to it alone. Any officials that Capito had in mind (he mentioned some specifically) could have been suspected of misconduct while handling the department's affairs. A local secretary might overcharge the purchaser of adespota and consequently rearrange his books, perhaps persuading a local trapezites to do the same. Some hapless landowner would be threatened with prosecution unless he paid a bribe to some official who had forged or changed local records or destroyed all the evidence pertaining to the man's ownership of his property.[33] There would be equal opportunity for corruption within the administration. It is natural to assume that such matters that came to the dialogismos as concerned the affairs of the idios logos would be considered by the head of that department and not by the prefect. That is, the department had jurisdiction over those officials who practiced their extortion, forgeries, etc. while conducting the department's business.

All this presumes that the head of the department did take an active part in deciding such cases at the dialogismos as involved administrative fraud perpetrated at the expense of the idios logos. It is not the same point of view that [illegible] evidently had in mind when he translated lines [illegible] [illegible]. Jouguet's explanation, [illegible] for which there is no [illegible]. It is [illegible] reasonable to assume that Capito, who required that [illegible], had intended that cases which were pertinent [illegible] the department's business [illegible]. The [illegible] line 35 was to receive information against those [illegible] appropriating funds, or through those who were working with him [illegible] the eklogistai, that such [illegible] were to be reported to the department for judgment, not for collecting fines from the guilty parties.

Although neither Alexander's nor Capito's edict adds anything to the specific functions of the idios logos discussed in the chapters of the preceding sections, both confirm that the prefect [illegible]. There were the hearings in the department. The agenda of the idios logos at the dialogismos was rather crowded. Both edicts indicate that [illegible] and [illegible] procedure at these hearings and in general to ferret out administrative abuses resulted in the prefect. Neither edict, however, implies with certainty that the prefect in any way

33. [illegible] again the family of Sarapion [illegible] an example. It will be [illegible] find the record of his [illegible] which was [illegible] 1932 [illegible].

34. P. Jouguet, op. cit. p. 77.

could control or alter the substance of the ideai logoi or its administrative duties.

ὁ πρὸς τῷ ἴδιῳ λόγῳ

Lucia Paullina was the daughter of M. Vergilius Gallus Lepsius who was ὁ πρὸς τῷ ἴδιῳ λόγῳ, probably some time during the principate of Tiberius. She has recorded for us only a single dedicated to her father and brother the name of another occupant of that office and a very incipient cursus, which will allow an opportunity for some reflection on the bureaucratic character of the Julio-Claudian administration of the ideai logoi. *CIL* X 4862, which was found at Venafrum, reads as follows:

Lucia M. f. Paullina
Sex. Vettulieni Cerialis
uxor
M. Vergilio M. f. Ter. Gallo Lepsio
praef. praet. pit. leg. XI. praef. cohort.
Ubiorum pedestri et equitum. donato
hasta pura ab Imp. Augusto corona aurea
ab Imp. Aug. et Ti. Caesare Aug. praef. fabr.
III, trib. mil. coh. in germ. ubi [bello]
ad Aegyptum. Her. rerum. praesi
A. Lucio A. f. Gallo. statu
trib. mil. leg. XXIII. primigeniae, praef. equit

The career of Vergilius, in Pflaum's opinion, is typical for the early principate.[16] A suggestion by Mommsen that *praesi* in line 9 is equivalent to *praefecto*[17] would reverse the order but not change the essential character of the cursus. Vergilius' post as head of the ideai logoi raises some difficulties for this first attempt at the department of Rome appears quite contrary to the Greek division between the department of ideai logoi, and its chief officer, ὁ πρὸς τῷ ἴδιῳ λόγῳ. The ideai logoi in the dedication seems to be a title, not an office: Vergilius was only logos numbered of the ideai logoi.

It should be noted in passing that inasmuch as the terms in the dedication are in the dative, the ideai logoi may not be used to prove a Latin nominative ideilogus. Did the nominative ever exist, whether ideilogus or more probably ideai logus, ideai logi, ideilogi, equivalent to a title in the mind of the translator, and was it such in the epitaph of Vergilius himself or whoever appointed him head of the ideai logoi in Egypt? The Greek evidence offers no generalization prior to the Flavians for combining ideai logoi with a personal title. The first Roman to express

16 Pflaum, No. 5

17 In the appointment of Ti. Claudius Balbillus (*CIL* X 4862)

in Latin the title given to the head of the ides legio, whether Livius, Vergilius or Tiberius, was faced with a problem in translation, and not an easy one at that. He had the convenience of neither an equivalent Roman office (for there was not one, nor of the second century compromise of ἐπὶ τῶν ὅπλων, ἐπὶ τῶν Τιβερίου Ἀλεξάνδρου ὁ κρατῶν τὴν ἐπὶ τῶν ὅπλων ἡγεμονίαν [see Wolf below]) to translate that, become involved in a lengthy paraphrase, he or she may have chosen simply to transliterate the name of the department and to present this reinterpretation as a personal title.

An alternative explanation would hypothesize a preposition missing before *ides legio*. It is on this line that the city's epigraphical difficulty with the term occurs with a breakdown of the formula. Any preposition would have a far more sensible rendering of the Greek title as an adequately Roman title than *ides legio* alone.[1] Without it, we would have to conclude that *ides legio* was mistakenly understood as a title. However the author(s) of these publications have viewed the *ides legio* whether as a department of the Senate or Imperial Court headed by an *ab ides legio* or as a personal title and a department, he failed to confuse the *ides legio* with the ex praetoria post. Here is the translation offered by modern commentators. Does Virgo was also Legio or Ides Legio. The only other adequate translation would be a detailed description.

The few details about Vergilius preserved by the epitaphs reveal a normal equestrian career of civil and military offices. It appears that upon the death of his daughter Livia he left the Praetorian Guard, was adopted by Livius Virgilius (he had evidently married the wife of A. Livius Gallus Sulpicius Rufus) and Livia's brother A. Livius A.f. Gallus (whose name was subsequently changed to Livia's brother Vergilius nephew's name to Livius Vergilius) and subsequently after serving as military tribune in the Praetorian and praetorian cohorts, was married to Sex. Vergilius Longus and was probably the Sextius Vergilius Longus who held the Sextian Vergilian Longus and the Gemina Vergilian Gallus, who commanded the 5th legion in Judea during the Jewish wars and who was the brother of C. Vergilius Gallus.

Vergilius' tenure as head of the *ides legio* was his last imperial appointment. He retired to Venafrum where he now served as duumvir and ended his life as pontifex, perhaps with a handsome inheritance from his adopted father Vergilius.

A list of the known chief officers of the Julio-Claudian *ides legio* follows:

Q. Arrius Varus	A.D. 13
C. Seppius Rufus	A.D. 14-16
M. Vergilius M.f. Gallus Livius	Tiberius
Servaeus Severus	A.D. 44

[1] Wolf has suggested that the *ab* was omitted because the *praefectus* retained a personal relationship to the *legio* [illegible]

L. Tullius Sabinus	A.D. 45–46
Norbanus Ptolemaeus	A.D. 63

The length of appointment is not determinable but was probably irregular.[39] Rufus may have served for three years.[40] Semanus and Sabinus are included on the list on the basis of the latter's role as *P. Vitellii Hermiae l.*[41] The office was no doubt conferred directly by the princeps. We know that L. Volusenus Clemens, who died before assuming office, had been appointed prefectus by Tiberius (*cf.* VI 8011). We may assume that appointments to the idios logos were similarly made.[42]

The careers of the other heads of the idios logos were probably much the same as Vergilius'. The exception would be Norbanus Ptolemaeus, who was probably a non-Italian.[43] Such, however, was to be expected in a post Claudian civil appointee. The idios logos, as well as the other sub-prefectorial offices in Julio-Claudian Egypt, represented the highest provincial civil post for the competent but perhaps lowborn bureaucrat. The only known exception to this rule was T. Caesius Rufus, who was promoted by Vespasian and who went on to become a flamboyant prefect. All the other known officials continued as eminent local dignitaries in their home towns. At least we hear nothing to the contrary.

B. STRABO 17.1.12

Strabo's brief description of the idios logos, the earliest Roman reference to the department, can now be considered in the light of the documents we have just seen. The modern opinions on the dating of Strabo's publication all point to a

39 [illegible]

40 [illegible]

41 [illegible]

42 [illegible]

43 [illegible]

first edition during the last decade of the first century B.C.[44] The absence of references to events in the principate of Augustus after 6 B.C. is the most attractive evidence. At least Strabo's research for his "first" edition ended by that date. A revised edition, which included references to Tiberius, was published during the early years of that reign. Hence the latest possible date for the information given in Book 17 would be in the second and third decades of the first century. It is not probable, however, that Strabo felt any need to revise his brief statement on the administration of Egypt. More pertinent for our purposes is a determination of the date when Strabo gathered the information he related.

He was in Egypt with the prefect Aelius Gallus (2.5.12; [illegible] B.C.). He apparently was there in 20 B.C. when Augustus was at Samos (14.1.14). The years with Gallus would have offered sufficient opportunity for collecting the data presented at the beginning of section 12 of Book 17 ([illegible]). Strabo might have remained in Alexandria from 24 to 20 B.C. in order to use the Museum. It is fairly certain, then, that Strabo's general statement reflects the Roman administration of Egypt ca. 26 B.C. [illegible] definitely by 6 B.C.

[illegible Greek] Strabo [illegible] might have taken issue with him about the wisdom of a certain prefect, but would not dispute the wealth of the province. He went on to [illegible] of the prefect and his immediate subordinates [illegible Greek] On the one hand [illegible] the King and on the other under him was the [illegible]. Another [illegible] the prefect was the idios logos [illegible Greek] and appears in most of the manuscripts.[45] [illegible] that we found in the [illegible] dedicated to [illegible] of Strabo, a person or an office? The Greek [illegible] the former. The prefect was the chief [illegible] in Egypt. Under him there were certain subordinates [illegible] there was the [illegible] a department. It would be logical to expect the [illegible] to be a person. "Another person subordinate to the prefect is the so-called idios logos" is the obvious translation of the Greek. Strabo, however, was not [illegible] of the exact significance of "idios logos" and evidently did not expect his readers to be familiar with the title, for he qualified his statement with [illegible]. The

44. [illegible] The Geography of Strabo (Loeb Classical Library [illegible]) [illegible]; [illegible] Anderson, "Some Questions Bearing on the Date and Composition of Strabo's Geography," in Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay, ed. Buckler and Calder (1923) [illegible] [illegible]

45. [illegible] idios logos [illegible]

Greek ὅτεῳ is ambiguous — the relative pronoun ὅς can be either "who" or "which." Hence, if we are forced to concede that Strabo contrary to the direct evidence that we have accumulated thought that "ethnarchies" were personal rule, we might find an explanation for that "mistake" in his utterance. And, if the pronoun meant "which," in Strabo, there would be misconception on his part. But Strabo's Greek is a bit more ambiguous than would appear at first sight, and must be reconsidered in the evidence of the documents.

Turning to the examination of the information about the department, we find that Strabo's description is at once too narrow — the functions of the department were beyond that of an investigator — and too broad to say that Kaisar terrae ἐπιστάτης could only be the provincial bureau agency in the Roman administration of Egypt. His very brief statement reveals a remarkable similarity to the formula: ἐπιστάτης τῶν ἀναθημάτων τῶν ἐν Ἀθήναις καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἱερῶν of P. Oxy. 1185 and 2777. The verb ἐπιστατεῖν calls the department under A.D. 17 (or properly 13 B.C.) to which "there may be here an indication of an early definition of the competence of the department such as would be needed by answering to the remarks of the Roman historians."

That the chief is a certain "investigator" is adequate enough, it is understood that this included full administration. Strabo's rather narrow ἐξετάσεις may have been developed by the chief inspectors of the department during the early prospecting looking down all the properties in Egypt to which there were specific rights, land which was technically royal land and land which had not been assigned to the hands of private owners and which therefore fell to Caesar. It would be difficult to separate as Strabo appears to have done the administrative responsibilities of the chief inspectors in this respect from the ἐξετάσεις. However, the chief's chief concern did go beyond the sale of land and the determination of problems connected with such property. The department was, after all, the sales agent for royal land specifically [illegible] which the government had decided to sell. We must understand the various Καίσαρος κτήματα as a sort of catch-all which was intended to include all those functions of the department that were not specifically involved with the ἐπιστάται.

Strabo described the department in the known records in a single clause. In this clause he omits and what the Augustan documents reveal as the chief concern of the chief inspectors, the ἐξετάσεις of the ἐπιστάται. He also left room for the inclusion of other functions outside of the ἐπιστάται, but indicated by non-evidence as within the competence of the department. He did not, however, intend his definition to justify the assignment to the chief inspectors of such financial

[illegible] of this term [illegible] and does not appear in an [illegible]

or administrative functions as might suit the fancy of a casual reader but he also doubtless wanted his brief clause to encompass everything that he knew definitely to be a concern of the department.

3. SUMMARY: THE JULIO-CLAUDIAN IDIOS LOGOS

To achieve a full understanding of the idios logos from Augustus to Nero, it may be helpful to preface the general conclusions with a discussion of the distinctions drawn, and not drawn, between the Ptolemaic background and its Roman counterpart. This can best be done by attempting to discover in the Roman evidence used in this chapter such contrasts and parallels as existed in the functions and competence of the idios logos of the two eras.

The Ptolemaic idios logos[1] started as a "special account" which recorded the revenues received from the sale of property confiscated by the king. The account broadened in scope until it became a "privileged bureau" [2] The Roman administration which nearly succeeded the Ptolemaic not only inherited the idios logos but also used as precedent for its powers that was recorded for the Ptolemaic department's functions. Ptolemaic idios logos[3] included all property that devolved to the king and did not readily come under the supervision of any other royal government agencies. In general, the property that was in the department's custody could not be easily disposed of by the debtors through sales or bequests or assignments, and was also profitable to the government while it was held. The department's chief concern was selling the property under its control and recording the proceeds received. The Ptolemaic idios logos[4] also included the proceeds received from those persons who had legacies assigned to them which were actually or eventually under the department's jurisdiction.

When Augustus became the successor to the Ptolemies in Egypt and the department of idios logos both became and also sought to emulate its predecessor's history from the earliest days of Roman rule in Egypt and also throughout the Ptolemaic to the Roman eras. The transition was a rather significant change. From Strabo's vague description and from the Julio-Claudian evidence relating to the idios logos, one can observe that the idios logos retained the functions and duties which it had possessed under the Ptolemies. Where the documents discussed in this chapter disagree with accounts which were deposited there was from the sale of confiscated property and property that was under the department's control. These accounts consisted of τὰ ἐκ τῶν δημεύσεων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων λόγων.[5]

In about 1000 the Ptolemaic idios logos had evidently reached a stage in its development where it was a receiver for confiscated property. There is no proof that any private property was ever confiscated directly εἰς τὸν ἴδιον λόγον during the first centuries of Roman rule in Egypt. Instances where the department might

[1] The evidence for the idios logos from A. Engelmann, Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik, 1 (1967), 1–10, is now available in an expanded form in his publication mentioned in note 2 above.

have been expected to be the receiving or confiscating agent do not imply that the idios logos was even remotely involved. Thus in BGU 1200 [illegible] B.C.), there is a reference to some ecclesiastical property that was confiscated εἰς τὸ δημόσιον. P. Teb. 302 [illegible] refers to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] τοῦ ἡγεμονεύσαντος ἐκ [illegible] γῆς. This does not mean that the department never came into contact with property that had been confiscated. It would seem that all the arable land confiscated during the early principate became royal land, but if any of the confiscated property became barren and as such unrentable or unassignable through any of the regular processes or through imperial gift, it was placed in the category of ἀδέσποτα and released to the idios logos for immediate sale. The fact that the idios logos was neither confiscating agent nor recorder of property confiscated from private owners does not imply a circumscription of the department's functions but indicates, rather, more politically and economically efficient employment for such property. In short, the apparent practice of returning property confiscated from private individuals back to private ownership through sale by the idios logos during the late Ptolemaic period was brought to an abrupt halt by Augustus. The growth of the great personal holdings of the imperial family and favorites such as the Petronii is evidence enough that a place was found for confiscated properties other than the administration of the idios logos and the department's auction block.[18]

Insofar as the adespota remained unchanged, it may be assumed that the Ptolemaic idios logos, once it had become a department, acted as sales agent for ownerless property which the government wanted to sell. This was demonstrably a function of the Roman department. From a practical point of view, the adespota falling within the competence of the Ptolemaic and early Roman idios logos consisted of property that was unsuitable or barren and, in general, unsuited for lease or regular assignment. The main task which the administration of the adespota involved was locating ownerless property, if possible, and acting as sales agent for it. The Roman idios logos had in addition the power to investigate and pass final judgment in cases of illegally occupied adespota. If the Ptolemaic office was likewise endowed with this capacity, we have no explicit evidence for it. The Ptolemaic department did, however, act as recorder of all payments received from those who had appropriated property which belonged to no specific category of government land and which could be essentially termed adespota. Such a payment, the [illegible], was [illegible] [illegible] adespota. Whether or not the Ptolemaic department had at its disposal the same administrative capacity as the Roman for implementing the investigation of illegally occupied government property will not be known until the information that has become available for

---

[18] The view [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Rostovtzeff, Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire, 2nd edition, pp. 669-672, and [illegible]

the Satabous affair is discovered for a similar Ptolemaic case.[49]

On the other hand, the Julio-Claudian idios logos did not, so far as our evidence is concerned, have anything to do with assessing property. There may, however, be little or no difference between the Ptolemaic procedure and the Roman payment-by-endeixis procedure, but the evidence is too tentative. We know that Sempronius [illegible] took possession of the property on which the gold the procurator. We have no positive proof that the Jugera Satabous received the empty lots when he paid his 500 drachmas to the *basilikon* and consequently, we cannot be sure that his payment exactly paralleled Sempronius' procedure.

In a broad sense, there was no radical change in the idios logos when it became a Roman office. It remained the office by which the private speculator could obtain property to exploit as he saw fit. The department's surroundings had always characterized the vast majority of private property as all probability remained at least unchanged during the waning days of the Ptolemies if it did not increase. Property that was [illegible] by private owners was returned through [illegible] to the state. There was no change in the Julio-Claudian period of any order that would have [illegible] private person and add to private property [illegible] to the state and to the refund or bestowal [illegible] the department's involvement with abandoned and [illegible].

A suggestion was made [illegible] administrative safeguard against [illegible] the department with income realized through [illegible] environment. A stable [illegible] in most abandonments of private property, [illegible] the [illegible] consolidated property, would [illegible] regular and irregular income. As Augustus [illegible] payments received through the [illegible] though they might be, would not be [illegible] All income realized through the [illegible] the department. The Principate was [illegible] in Egypt than in its [illegible] The [illegible] the function for which the Ptolemaic [illegible] The department continued to keep [illegible] managed. The income was [illegible]

The Julio-Claudian [illegible] payment [illegible] governments property was sold. [illegible]

49. If Sempronius had appeared [illegible] P. Amh. II, 33 [illegible] Augustus, the decision could be [illegible] [illegible] Hadrian [illegible] might be [illegible]

property that was to be sold or might have been sold by it. Some or all of its functions were described as a gnomon. It was directed by a Roman bureaucrat and was an important department of the administration of Egypt during the first century of Roman rule. Such are the components that must be explored in order to arrive at something approaching a coherent picture of the early imperial idios logos.

The idios logos acted as sales agent for two categories of government property, *dekumata* and *gē en eidiōi*. The latter was royal land that had become barren and consequently was not in good suitable for leasing or for being bestowed as imperial gifts. It was not demonstrably the department's decision that such properties be sold. It apparently did not come within the administrative purview of the idios logos until put up for sale. The price for such land was determined by the prefect (at least this was the case in A.D. 68/69). When it was advertised for sale, probably under the direction of the department, offers to buy could be submitted to the head of the department and this seems to have happened in a few instances when by chance was the vicinity of the place of the sale. The more usual procedure was to send a bid to the strategos or, conceivably, to some other magistrate in the area. The offer was passed over to local authorities for processing. The chief administrative aim of the idios logos with respect to the sale of *gē en eidiōi* must have been to see that such property was sold as quickly and as profitably as possible.

The acceptance of a bid through the department ranged from a grant lots to defeated bidders to which there was little but the governor's. The procedure was much the same as for private transactions, except that the price could be supported by the bidder. The department was concerned that the terms of the sale did not necessarily know about the existence of the property for which an offer was submitted. When it was a close question whether the department that the bidder was offering a fair price, the advocate of the idios logos, a procurator was consulted to determine if this was the case. The department's role would be a bit more complicated in this respect in that probably was consulted whenever the salability of a given piece of government property that was technically adopted was in doubt. For example, someone like Nestorplas in the Sarabaite affair might come upon a vacant lot which he discovered to be ownerless. The petition of a local secretary might call attention to the condition of the property, whether it was salable and hence liable to taxation as royal land and therefore not to be sold, or whether it was taxable only for building and profitable to the government only if sold. The department's main concern as sales agent for adespota, however, was to sell such waterless properties as rapidly and as profitably as possible. The idios logos no doubt received reports of government sales that were managed by local secretaries. It no doubt used a separate account to which payments received from sale of government property were deposited. There is no evidence that local bankers kept separate listings for income deposited to the *demosion* by virtue of sales through the idios logos.

There is, equally, no evidence to suggest that the department was notified of every sale of sale price. The chief sale agent for valuable property should be expected to have been so informed. It is clear from the case above that the administration could separate from the regular payment to the department the income realized from the sale of government property, which would be for the department to allocate to the treasury or sale to awarded to it.

The head of the department, wherever it was overseen during his administration, was personally directed to oversee sales and received offers for property that the department of local finances publicly advertised, a subject that had been discussed by a private committee.

It was through the ideology that hereditary temple offices were sold. The procedure for such sales is not at all clear, but an analogy with the sale of real estate might be expected. An offer would not be submitted directly to the department but could be given to a sale representative of the department of the department would notify the department of the sale. An question about the salability of a particular office or the price that should be paid would be ultimately settled by the ideologos. The department also oversaw the payment of the installation fee, the payment (the department, which was collected from a person assuming an ecclesiastical office as the legitimate heir of the last holder of an hereditary office. In both cases the payment was deposited in the department. The ideologos was to help the department in the administration of laws that saw to it that the proper fees were paid.

From the tenuous connection between the Tullius Sabinus of P. Oxyrhynchus Nonnianus 1, which provides the only indication that the Julio-Claudian ideologos was concerned with collection of financial matters, and the same Tullius Sabinus in P. Fay. 108, we have assumed that the department also supervised the payment received for the ecclesiastical emolument. It is probable that the department, it would be premature to rely on the meager evidence that we possess, acted as sale agent for all valuable temple offices.

It is impossible to determine from available evidence a date when the ideologos became the sales agent for ecclesiastical offices. We might theoretically connect the department with such sales through its supervision of the adoptions. An unrecognized practice that may be connected to property sales is the adoption without compensation of a child into a family whose child had predeceased the father or had paid the usual adoption fee for an hereditary office. Temple offices were obviously viewed as a commodity by the Julio-Claudian administration. As property that had once been in private hands and accepted priesthood was to be returned as private property by sale through the ideologos.

Perhaps we can broadly conclude from the advantages of property to which the department acted as sales agent that any property which was appropriable or appropriated by the government (from kings, Cleopatra, etc.) to become the government's permanent possession or was held to be bestowed as an imperial grant, was to be sold as private property within Egypt through the

idiot logon. In addition to the property for which we have direct evidence, it may be reasonably assumed that the bureau was sales agent for the nonmonetary or nonliquidable assets of confiscated estates of persons whose owners died without full legal heirs. These would include houses, chattels, etc., which were of value to the government only in part. There is admittedly circumstantial proof that the idiot logon was a routine sales agent for all government property previously in private hands but there is no direct evidence to the contrary. It was certainly the most convenient department for accomplishing such sales.

The department's role as an administrative body was quite reasonably from its involvement with government sales. It was responsible for the full management of all properties to be sold through its agency. A convenient distinction may be made between what we may call the routine steps of the idiot logon and those special administrative matters that arose from time to time.

The keeping of accurate and up-to-date records of property to be sold from the idiot logon would be the first order of routine business for the department. This provides a partial explanation for the regular administrative fact that the head of the department appeared in state at the beginning of the Roman year. The local secretaries, however, were probably chiefly responsible for keeping track of the property to be sold through the department, just as they were locally in charge of most government sales. There must have been a continual flow of information from the census to the department in Alexandria. Such communication was carried on through the regular bureaucracy, since no subordinates employed exclusively by the idiot logon appear in the sources.

Some properties immediately came under the department's competence on becoming escheats and thus real estate under the department's control. The *adquisitio* section of the logon had personnel who described in a formula compiled by legal specialists to determine whether a given piece of ownerless property was immediately assignable to the department and immediately salable thereafter.

Some of the property managed by the idiot logon was evidently assigned to it by other agencies and officials in the administration, with the obvious intention that the property be sold. The mass of immovable property confiscated by the government, to which the *fiduciarius idiot logon* was never the confiscating agent, would be expected to come under the department's control if it were disposable. The only specific example we have of this procedure is the case of buildings which the department did not manage until it was assigned to the department for sale.

The same procedure must have been used for the temple offices sold through the department. It can not be argued that the idiot logon had anything to do with the regular administration of ecclesiastical affairs, at least from the available evidence. The department assumed control only when notified that such offices were unoccupied and, hence, were to be sold or that an hereditary priesthood was to be transferred and an installation fee to be paid. This may have involved detailed listings of salable and hereditary offices, but does not imply exclusive

control of temple affairs. Once again, local officials were probably relied upon for collecting and recording pertinent data and reporting annual sales.

The administrative function that impressed and perhaps oppressed the general population was the department's role as investigator and judge in all cases of improper appropriation of property under its management. The *idios logos* had exclusive and complete jurisdiction over proceedings for possession of private property within its administrative competence. The Naqlun papyrus provides a glimpse of the routine followed in such cases. A denunciation accused the defendant before a senior official, or perhaps even a local one. The accused, who had the alternative of pleading guilty and seeking the case to be dropped, would have the suit against him brought to trial at the conventus at Alexandria, where it was heard by the department's chief officer. The delinquent, whether processed in Alexandria or Memphis, must have been notified by a [illegible] defendant for whom the necessities of travel and [illegible] provided ample incentive for a quick termination of the affair. On the basis of the accusation, he was found to have occupied property which [illegible] had been granted to him by the department. He was found guilty and upon pronouncement of the sentence the *idios logos* was ultimately in charge of all [illegible] property. [illegible] time directed personally. All information that was gathered, conclusions and all preliminary hearings held before the head bureau of the conventus were the responsibility of some officials. There were no special secretaries who were full time investigators for the *idios logos*.

We might conclude from the Naqlun affair, although we have no documented proof, that the department also investigated and judged those who were implicated in [illegible] properties. We might suppose a case where a local official [illegible] had received land [illegible] to the *idios logos* when it did not meet with the [illegible] The priests of Isis[illegible] provided [illegible] as they were to do [illegible] overcharged for a property. The [illegible] to investigate and judge [illegible] properties that was purchased [illegible] temple [illegible] told to [illegible] purchase of the [illegible] department had [illegible] in such a way [illegible] departmental affairs [illegible] administrative [illegible] property under [illegible]

Although the department's jurisdiction was absolute in matters that directly concerned the *idios logos*, this jurisdiction never extended outside of its administrative competence. The *idios logos* could not judge and [illegible]

the prophetes, even though he had admitted under oath that he had sold to Sarabous some vacant lots which the department considered to be under its control. As far as the department was concerned, Chaeremon's crime was against Sarabous, not the idios logos. It could only bring judgment against the actual although unwitting occupier of government property. In the light of such evidence, it would be unwise to extend our view of the department's role as investigator beyond what is certainly known to have been within the department's jurisdiction.

The "limited" judicial function of the idios logos had nevertheless impressed itself upon the population of Egypt. A generation of delators, motivated by vengeance or, if there was a system of rewards, by profit, were "swelling the city" and the agenda of the idios logos at the [illegible].

Some or perhaps all of the above functions were regulated by something called a gnomon. This gnomon, as it seems from P. Oxy. [illegible] and 2277, mentioned certain aspects of the administration of the adespota. Specifically, it defined which adespota were liable to immediate appropriation to the idios logos. That is, in more functional terms, it defined what properties on becoming ownerless could be more freely sold from the department. Since the idios logos was no longer the central agency [illegible] that it apparently had been at the end of the Ptolemaic period,[28] confiscated and ownerless property did not automatically fall to the department. Augustus was intent on having all arable property that had been confiscated or had become ownerless classified as royal land. But it would have been useless [illegible] had been necessary to transfer to the idios logos any non-arable land or land that had once been [illegible] to be sold to private buyers. A more workable [illegible] would be possible if a list or a description of properties that were [illegible] to be sold from the idios logos was drawn up. The gnomon mentioned in P. Oxy. [illegible] and 2277 must have been such a list or something quite similar. As such, it was available and familiar to the heads of the department as it was to local secretaries and, apparently, prospective buyers of adespota.

If the gnomon was in general a guide for the administration of the idios logos, it also contained information relating to matters of inheritance, which, in a stable political atmosphere, would be the main source of adespota. The non-capital assets from the estate of someone who had died without full legal heirs would be sold by the department. If the department was the final arbiter in determining what portions of an ownerless estate fell to it, we may assume that the Julio-Claudian gnomon contained such details on matters of inheritance as did the second-century gnomon, which will be more fully discussed in the next

28. The Julio-Claudian department [illegible] the [illegible] confiscated [illegible] property [illegible] of the [illegible] with the gnomon does not [illegible] confiscated property of [illegible] [illegible] property [illegible] [illegible] property.

chapter. Although there is no direct evidence of a gnomon as broad in scope for the first century of Roman rule in Egypt as there is for the second (the edict of Ti. Julius Alexander does indicate that by the end of Nero's reign, the gnomon was more general than the Ptolemaic texts imply. And we may cautiously reinspect from *BGU* 1210. The individuality of Egypt in its provincial character things during the early principate and the uniqueness of the [illegible] for which there is no analogy in the rest of the Roman world, would necessitate some sort of guide for the Roman equestrian who assumed control of that office. The gnomon may have served such a purpose.

The gnomon, depending on a possible interpretation of the edict of Ti. Julius Alexander's edict,[1] could be altered by prefect or Princeps if the details presumably contained in the gnomon referred to a specific relevant ordinance of the then-ruling one of the following manipulation of the gnomon would be the most effective and immediate means of controlling the department without actually changing substantially the nature of the department itself. While the department continued, for example, to supervise [illegible] production, adoption, an alteration in the gnomon's definition of such property might remove a significant amount of it from the bureau's administration.

The department was located in Alexandria. Its routine business would consist in receiving notices of the sale of property through the clerks who kept complete records of properties that had been appropriated to it and of former royal land that had been released to the city or to private owners. The office probably kept detailed lists of valuable [illegible] although the troubles encountered by the priests in P. Rainer 8 (*Wessely*) would suggest that no distinction was made in the records between hereditary priestly posts and those offices which were to be sold outright on the death of the occupant.

The department received information from delators and from individuals who were investigating legal occupation of government property. It carried out directives to the officials concerning such matters. The department staff was probably also concerned with recording hearings that were conducted by the department at the convento.

The head of the department was a Roman equestrian appointed by the Princeps. His role was [illegible]. By the principate of Nero a non-Italian may have been able to hold the position. Extrapolating from what we know of Vergilius Capito, the appointment was [illegible] for imperial eyes, a post from which the occupant could [illegible] with deputy. His task in Egypt was to oversee the affairs of the idios logos and the conduct of the [illegible] of what must have been a sizable staff in Alexandria. Through that staff he presumably [illegible] supervised nome and local secretaries in the regular bureaucracy who were conducting the department's business.

[illegible]

He was required to visit Egypt at times in conjunction with the prefect. On such occasions he directed departmental sales personally receiving offers for land and property to be sold through the department. His administrative prominence, however, stemmed not from his interest in the department's routine business, which was handled for the most part by local officials in the regular administration, but from his judgments on cases that came before the tribunal of the *conventus*. His judicial powers investigate, judge and fine those who were overseers (*epitropoi*) of public affairs. He also sat, it would appear, as a judge in cases that were brought up privately, but which had public implications. As the chief judge in general he was the final authority in the disciplinary activities of the officials of the *idios logos*. It is clear from the papyri that he was always referred to as 'supervising' the *idios logos*, and was never himself called '*idios logos*'.

Augustus presented the *idios logos* not to the accounting committee by which it was created in the second century BC, but to the administrative organ which recently had made a full department of the civil bureaucracy. Such a change of destination in terms of personnel and procedure was the most practical method of preventing the *idios logos* from becoming a private concern through which officials could amass personal fortunes at the expense of the state. Augustus' creation of a separate department of land that had become the property of the state by confiscation or by default of heirs, or by the death of the last legal claimant, was the private fief and imperial estate of the emperor. Private property in Roman Egypt and the administration of [illegible] were [illegible].

The establishment of the department might have gone beyond this administrative innovation. Land [illegible] was sold by surplus and determined by the two prefects who examined in the property was subordinate to the prefect's jurisdiction rather than to the [illegible]. Local alterations in the department's operation [illegible] was the prefect's. The [illegible] from the department's point of view the prefect's [illegible] was to [illegible] property. In the prefect and his agents had complete discretionary power to develop what properties were to be [illegible] by the [illegible] determining which such property was to be [illegible]. But the [illegible] also presented complex [illegible] which were to the administration. Once it was determined which property was to be [illegible], the *idios logos* had full [illegible] in selling such property and over the complicated [illegible] in terms of land property and for which it was the final judge. The [illegible] the prefect [illegible] additional labor. Perhaps more important, this [illegible] administration of the prefect and the administration of the *idios logos* provided a more careful supervision of imperial financial interests in Egypt. While a conflict might arise in

regard to whether a given piece of property was liable to appropriation to the idios logos or, rather, ought to become royal land, there would be a conflict over whether or not it was appropriable to the government. A common administration for both revenue and non-revenue producing properties might not be nearly so efficient, or at least not so realized.

The distinction also provided a check on the regular income and local bureaucracy. A secretary in the chora who generally oversaw temple and arable land acquisitions would be discouraged from adding his appointed department's share of such sales and rentals directed there. If a secretary confiscated the capital assets from the estate of someone who had died without legal heirs and did not terminate the income producing properties, he would be investigated and prosecuted by the separate bureaucracy devoted to the administration of such properties. The two departments in reality would not be lost amid the red tape of a single administration which was necessary to separate the various types of government properties and management strategies.[1]

The distinction, lastly, might have provided another check on the prefect himself. With the above-stated exceptions of private sale and private grant, neither of which was ordinarily open to manipulation by the prefect, the acquisition of private property into landowners' hands was the right of the prefect. He was invested with the authority to accept heirs who he favored, certain landowners with whom he had a personal connection, or others who enhanced his own reputation and influence. His local agents might also have indulged in personal speculation in regard to such properties. As it was, the prefect might threaten or cajole owners of private property to the same purpose that he pursued. But he could not grant land to himself through the transfer of government property. He was removed from the temptation. He could reduce private to government property, but such alienations would be used immediately by the idios logos which would purchase or receive purchase of government land without disturbing the administration.

By analogy the same expectation may be assigned to the department's relationship to the temples. The ecclesiastical administrator supervised regular temple income and routine temple affairs. He also oversaw the hiring of temple officials and perhaps determined who was competent to occupy such offices was reserved to the idios logos. A separate department was reserved into the secular and ecclesiastical branches' administration of Egypt to protect the interests of an imperial bureaucracy which was being served by fallible human agents. The possibilities of corruption in Alexandria by the prefectural and ecclesiastical administrations and by the idios logos was restricted to the functions of each individual administration. Any attempt at manipulation would become immediately evident to one or another overseer.[2]

1. Cf. Gustav Wolff, *Das Fiskalgut im römischen Reiche* (Leipzig, 1910), pp. 111–112.

Chapter Three

The Idios Logos under the Flavians and Antonines

The *Gnomon of the Idios Logos* and a deluge of post-Neronian documents reveal an idios logos significantly different from the pre-Flavian department. The second century [illegible] inevitably, from the Julio-Claudian department. The [illegible] of the idios logos, which were, as far as the evidence of the last chapter indicated, always restricted to the department's administrative [illegible] as confiscation, investigation and adjudication [illegible] matters that did not necessarily have a bearing on its [illegible] administrative capacities, and the department [illegible] its involvement with ecclesiastical affairs and matters pertaining to inheritance and civil status, gained an increased competence.

I. TEMPLE AND IDIOS LOGOS

The relationship of the idios logos to temple affairs that was posited on the basis of a mutilated statement [illegible] Julio-Claudian period [illegible] emphatically [illegible] entries in the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos*, paragraphs [illegible]. There are also a number of post-Neronian papyri which [illegible] between the rather restricted role of the department in [illegible] matters in the first century, and the [illegible] suggested by the *Gnomon* for the second. [illegible] and other documents [illegible] considered individually [illegible] the idios logos, but the [illegible] and shows the development [illegible] of the department's pre-Flavian [illegible] matters. An examination of the papyri and the *Gnomon* [illegible] as closely as possible the department's connection with second-century temple affairs.

In April of A.D. [illegible] the [illegible] Ulpius Serenianus, in issuing a [illegible] on the right of the [illegible] enumerated in SB 9016 a list of precedents upon which he was basing his decision. The prior [illegible] all from [illegible], were chronologically as follows:

1. a decision by Cn. Vergilius Capito on Phamenoth 1, A.D. 48, (lines 5-9)

2. the decision of Lysimachos ὁ πρὸς τῷ ἴδιῳ λόγῳ on Mecheir 4, A.D. 69. Lines 9–18.

3. a second decision delivered by Lysimachos on Mecheir 4, A.D. 88. Lines 11–19.

The verdict of the antarchiereus is contained in lines 1–4, with his subscriptio added in column 2 of the papyrus. The dispute arose on all four occasions over who was to designate the neokoros at Ptolemais, the *komē* of the priest. The problem relevant to this study is the identity of the authorities with jurisdiction in such disputes.

In A.D. 48 it was quite clear to the priests who solved the problem. The neokoros appointed in 46 had evidently overstepped his position, for the case was heard [illegible] that concerned the head of the idios logos, Lysimachos, resolved the argument over who was to be the new neokoros. The intervention of Tullius Rufinus in the dispute at Nilopolis in 45 or 44 (*P. Lond.* II p. 194) provides a parallel. The explanation is clear: it was to the advantage of Ptolemaios in 69/70 A.D. that the department that sought offices were purchased and by the department that kept land records the assignment of such offices were participated and judged, but [illegible] there is an obvious difference from the situation in the years when the priests [illegible] In 48 Lysimachos was certainly appointed to [illegible] and Lysimachos was required to consult his colleagues [illegible] whether to hear the case [illegible] Although the dialogismos at Memphis where the neokoros' [illegible] would be quite [illegible] Lysimachos' [illegible] and perhaps [illegible] Upon [illegible] the [illegible] and [illegible] the [illegible] Thus in the years [illegible] the [illegible] the [illegible] A.D. [illegible] the [illegible] administrative [illegible] Alexandria [illegible] a reasonable [illegible]

The dispute which [illegible] the Idios Logos at Ptolemais, the priests of the temple of [illegible] where the neokoros was located [illegible] the administrative [illegible] the priests acted as the [illegible] probably [illegible]

[illegible]

administrator's attention was focused on the status of the [illegible]. The claim was no doubt put forward that it was the hereditary possession of the temple. This was a matter for the idios logos. [illegible] head of the idios logos was neither in conflict with the competence of the prefect nor [illegible] a new role for the idios logos. The rights of the [illegible] had been decided by [illegible]. Lysimachus decided that the status of [illegible] had [illegible] changed, and thus his verdict was [illegible] and [illegible] within [illegible] the idios logos. For some unknown reason the [illegible] judgment, only to come up against Lysimachus a second time. He had not only the precedent of a prefectorial verdict to [illegible] that he was not usurping the prefect's prerogatives in the case, but also his own [illegible]. He came to a rapid decision.

By [illegible] the dispute was [illegible] matter to be decided by ecclesiastical authorities on the basis of [illegible]. [illegible] Serenianus would have no reason to [illegible] that he was [illegible] with the competence of either the prefect or the [illegible] to know perfectly well what the [illegible] in this case. He passed judgment without referring the case to other authorities.

The role of the idios logos [illegible] from that deduced from the prefectorial [illegible]. It was through the department that any [illegible] was appointed [illegible] the department [illegible] the proper [illegible].

To recapitulate, the idios logos was [illegible] whether or not a [illegible] which was to be [illegible] had been previously purchased as an hereditary [illegible] the protection of Lysimachus, the head of the idios logos [illegible]. By [illegible] the well-kept records of the [illegible] removed the need to appeal either to the prefect or [illegible]. As a routine ecclesiastical matter the [illegible] a verdict. He had assumed a prerogative of the idios logos [illegible] that he had usurped [illegible] function of the prefect.

The office of [illegible] at the temple of [illegible] was not the only position requiring a decision from the idios logos [illegible] at Nilopolis, whose appearance before [illegible] of Chapter Two, appealed to the idios logos [illegible] demanded

[illegible]

[illegible] From what can be extracted from the scrappy documents describing the difficulties of the previous Eponym period, there had been an overcharge of some 270 drachmas when compensation for the prophetess and hostess at Nikopolis. This had come about, according to the priests, because the late prophetess and hostess had paid their taxes high prices. But since the offices were hereditary, and had been leased to Tullius Sabinus, the installation fee should have been 77 drachmas [illegible] the priests complained to a local official and were delegated to Gaius Gessius, who had succeeded Lysimachus in the eponymous [illegible] The investigation of the matter, which was by [illegible] a routine departmental procedure, was turned over to the [illegible]. The priests had evidently composed their case, which included a summary of the hearing before Sabinus and the investigation of the new Eponym, so far as it had progressed by [illegible] in preparation for a final hearing before Gessius.

The department's jurisdiction over this was no different from its jurisdiction in AP, 69 and 70. A question had arisen whether a temple office was hereditary or not. Some such offices were to be protected through the department. Any problem concerning the administration of ecclesiastical positions was to be settled by the department. The relevant [illegible] was Lucullus in 68 and 69 Gessius should decide who would designate the candidate who would pay for the necklace. The question in 69 was the amount to be paid *pro* enlargement for a prophetess and hostess. The priests contended that the offices were hereditary and were to be transferred to the legal [illegible] payment of the dowries of 77 drachmas and [illegible] Their chief witness was the governor-designate of Tullius Sabinus, who had witnessed the sale. The evidence against them was 1. the opinion of the bouleutogeneis who might have been responsible for the alleged overcharge that the offices were not hereditary, and 2. the fact that the late prophetess and hostess had paid the same high price demanded from the new holder of the offices.

The most complicated pressed case that the gerousiarchs was required to handle by virtue of its jurisdiction over disputes involving temple officials arose through [illegible] on [illegible] October 5, 110, the priests of Sabazios at Nysa addressed to the strategos Aelius Sarapion a complaint of a disputed [illegible] which they had been unable to [illegible] The [illegible] and document presented to the gerousiarchs [illegible] the outlines of the case but [illegible] merely a contrast enough information to outline the department's role in the affair. The events preceding the summary of AP, 110 were apparently as follows.

1 Sotades the father of Sosocles died. He has been priest and

[illegible]

prophetes of Sokonopaios and ought to have been succeeded by his son since the offices were allegedly hereditary (line 16).

2 Nephereus son of Onnophris, the villain in the opinion of the authors of the document, thought that he had a reason for claiming the offices. With this in mind and perhaps with the aid of [illegible] the homographmateus, who is described as an enemy, a notice he had [illegible] presented to Herakleides the strategos in [illegible] (lines 16–18).

3 At this point the priests mentioned a copy of hypomnematismos indicating that a preliminary hearing may have taken place before the strategos or before Claudius Julianus who was ὁ κράτιστος ἡγεμὼν ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰγύπτου (lines 18–20).

4 Whatever may have been the immediate results of Nephereus' appearance before the strategos, strategos and his comrades sent a *libellus* to Claudius Julianus in which they requested information about a hearing before a certain Asinius who might have been [illegible]-grammateus in addition to the one that may have taken place before the strategos the epistates who may have been [illegible], someone who had thrown them out of the house, something [illegible] and strategos [illegible] (lines 20–23).

5 Julianus turned the *libellus* over to Herakleides with a note requesting him to conduct an investigation (lines 24–25).

6 There was a hearing before the new strategos Aelius Nemesianus. Ammonius, a client/agent of Nephereus, the latter of Claudius Julianus, was involved. Ammonius submitted further papers [illegible] (lines 25–27). Did Nephereus have an hereditary priesthood or was he [illegible]? Did he [illegible] with Nephereus to have the priesthood transferred to him [illegible] the family's title of the offices? Did the [illegible] the temple pay illegal profits from the sale of the offices? Did Nephereus pay someone illegally for the offices? Did the [illegible] of the other priests of the temple, a price being paid for the prophetate? (lines 27–34).

7 Evidently the [illegible]-grammateus Asinius assumed control of the investigation at this point for he issued an ἐπίκρισις ἐξέτασιν, to which the priests were replying with an oath (line 34).

The questions upon which Nemesianus was inquiring indicate that the interests of the priests lay more in whether than determining who was to occupy a given office and thereby gain a salary, prestige, and perquisites. When the friends of Nemesianus appealed to Julianus they may have believed that the problem was simple to have the documents from Nephereus in which the latter was described as [illegible] at Sokonopaios and Hatkemau in the past. Since we do not know the final solution to the case, we may speculate that this was the situation and that it went no further. If the offices were found to be

mishandling of temple offices sold through it. It should be noted that the idios logos was not interested so much in the orderly management of temples as it was in the financial well-being of the fiscus. There was a possibility in the business at Soknopaiou Nesos that a payment had not been made [illegible], that there had been a payment [illegible] when a much higher sale price should have been charged [illegible] that the priests of the temple were guilty of illegal conduct with respect to the positions and should be fined accordingly. [illegible], in directing the investigation and eventually passing judgement on the affair at Soknopaiou Nesos, was not performing the duties of the [illegible]. The running of the temple was of concern to him only insofar as it involved offices that were to be sold by the department or possible fines that were to be paid by those found guilty of abusing these same offices. The [illegible] affair provides an adequate precedent.

The earliest of the surviving documents providing a key to understanding the department's 'ecclesiastical' activities which have been thus far discovered is *P. Teb.* 294 (= *W. Chr.* 78). The papyrus is a copy of a petition composed on the [illegible] of January 146.

Ἀντίγραφον.
Τιβερίῳ Κλαυδίῳ [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

ἐκ τῶν [illegible] ὡς πρόκειται μετὰ τῶν [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] ἀργυρίου
[illegible]
Διευτύχει.
(Ἔτους) [illegible] Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Τίτου Αἰλίου Ἁδριανοῦ
Ἀντωνίνου Σεβαστοῦ Εὐσεβοῦς [illegible]

The orthography of the text is rather [illegible]. Aside from line 2, the scribe who made the copy, whether he was attempting to imitate irregularities in the original or was himself [illegible], [illegible] article in line [illegible] 12 [illegible] line 23 [illegible] was omitted [illegible] of line 6 and [illegible] line 11, but [illegible] where appropriate. There is [illegible] in line 27. [illegible] the strange [illegible] Antoninus [illegible]. Whatever [illegible] Tiberius Claudius [illegible] and his title should have been [illegible].

Pakebkis wanted to buy a prophetic office that had long been vacant. A certain Marsisouchos had offered to pay [illegible] drachmas for the office, but Pakebkis was willing to pay [illegible] drachmas [illegible] the local [illegible] that

1. [illegible]
2. he be allowed to carry the palm branch,
3. he be allowed to perform all of the duties pertaining to the office,
4. he receive a fifth of the [illegible] of the temple,
5. and that the office remain the property of himself and his heirs, to whom the office would be transferred on the payment of [illegible] drachmas [illegible].

He requested that [illegible] the strategos [illegible] the sale was [illegible]. The prophetic office [illegible]. Perhaps Marsisouchos who had [illegible] to buy the office [illegible] for which [illegible] drachmas. P. Teb. 294 substantiates the [illegible] that [illegible] offices were purchased from the [illegible] and that the [illegible] in receiving such petitions and investigating [illegible] these offices was not acting in the capacity of the high priest but as the administrator and sales agent for [illegible].

The next three papers in the Tebtunis collection, P. Teb. 295–297, concern problems surrounding the sales of prophetess between A.D. 123 and 137, all of

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

which may have come to the department's attention. *P. Teb.* 296 may be a letter from the department, and 297 an abstract of a hearing in the idios logos court. *P.Mil.* 22.3 [illegible] during the reign of Commodus, has an entry of [illegible] which [illegible]. The statement [illegible] was recorded in SB [illegible] paid [illegible] through the idios logos might have been [illegible]. It was apparently [illegible] in the price of a major office. It might also have been paid for any of a host of non-ecclesiastical reasons.[?]

The department's role in temple affairs as described above expanded quite reasonably from its pre-Flavian antecedents. Every aspect of this role can be traced directly to the bureau's basic role as [illegible] agent for temple affairs. Competence in such matters was [illegible] different from the [illegible] which [illegible] exercised over all of the government properties assigned to its care. Evidently the idios logos continued to [illegible] ecclesiastical positions, and thus as an important and impartial third party between the popular ecclesiastical administration and the [illegible] temples. There are, however, a number of papyri and several paragraphs of the Gnomon which, when considered separately, imply a more intimate connection between idios logos and temple than we have been willing to admit from the evidence thus far examined. The documents to be discussed in the following pages have been the main evidence for those [illegible] of the high priesthood and the idios logos, a [illegible] which some believe may have extended back to Augustus.[?] However, although this evidence reveals a nexus between the department and the ecclesiastical administration quite similar to the connection posited above, this connection can be explained without assuming that the head of the idios logos must have been archiereus.

BGU [illegible] appears to deal with a matter of ritual procedure. Pakysis the son of Pakysis offered in Hadrian's [illegible] year, [illegible], a sacrificial animal which he claimed had been [illegible] sacrificed by [illegible] in the proper and usual way. He claimed further that [illegible] the customary [illegible]. Subsequently, [illegible] and some others who [illegible] in which they stated that Pakysis had [illegible] to sacrifice an improperly [illegible]. Word was sent to [illegible], to which Pakysis responded in *BGU* [illegible] with a statement to the [illegible].

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] reveals another reply to an order for investigation, this time from [illegible] addressed to Hierax the strategos and [illegible] the basilikogrammateus of the Arsinoite Nome. In [illegible] six priests of Soknopaiou Nesos answer a statement by the agents of the emperor concerning one of their fellow priests who had been denounced for letting his hair grow long and wearing a woolen garment.

Both cases involve ecclesiastical procedure. In the first the delators allege that a bull had been sacrificed without first being ritually sealed. The routine for such a sacrifice required that the person offering the animal receive certain [illegible] from the person performing the ritual. In this case, the allegation that a bullock had been improperly sealed and offered was directed to the idios logos instead of the ecclesiastical authorities. The department directed all investigations into the matter and presumably delivered the final verdict. So also in the case of those who have long hair and wear woolen garments contrary to the regulations of their clerical office. The investigation of such irregularities was obviously a function of the idios logos.

There is no apparent connection between improper ecclesiastical activity and the other temple matters with which the department was concerned. Specifically, the investigation of these improprieties has nothing to do with the sale of priestly offices. [illegible] the documents of the [illegible] the two Berlin papyri, along with [illegible] were considered [illegible] concluded that the idios logos and the office of the high priest were one and the same. The Gnomon with its [illegible] temple activities was taken as final proof. Paragraphs [illegible] and [illegible] of the Gnomon [illegible] and [illegible] the department's interests to [illegible] Paragraph [illegible] suggests a fine [illegible]

Although the department's involvement in temple affairs has been ascribed in the previous pages [illegible] as an impartial [illegible] ecclesiastical supervisor over irregular payments due to the fiscus from the sale of temple positions, and arbiter of all disputes concerning such sales, it must be admitted that the new functions illustrated by the Berlin texts and the Gnomon section was involved a sizable commodity. The department's concern for irregular income due the fiscus from [illegible] for ecclesiastical impropriety does not, however, mean that the idios logos was exercising a prerogative of the high priesthood. Whether this

[illegible]

the occupation of these same offices; (3) investigator and judge for all cases of ecclesiastical impropriety liable to a fine. As sales agent the department operated very much as it must have done in the [illegible] period [illegible] in general, supervising the sale of offices and in particular receiving [illegible] of such sale or acts of tenders from prospective purchasers which often were [illegible] to [illegible] for processing. The [illegible] had [illegible] over the payment [illegible] depended [illegible] who succeeded to an hereditary position. The department quite naturally would have been concerned with the rapid and profitable sale of all vacant non-hereditary offices and may have been [illegible] if any office remained unoccupied for any length of time. The [illegible] contained some information pertaining to this function. Paragraph 78 explained how a non-hereditary prophetess was to be [illegible] and [illegible] were payable [illegible] the department.

The department's jurisdiction over irregularities in the occupation of temple offices was a supplement to its role as sales agent. Of immediate concern to the [illegible] were the qualifications of a given individual to occupy a position that he wished to purchase or to which he had succeeded. The department had the final say in every dispute concerning the ecclesiastical credentials of a person holding an office sold through its agency. It was the final authority in determining the ecclesiastical [illegible] of persons who were lacking qualifications [illegible] occupied a temple office. A [illegible] question [illegible] whether an office was hereditary [illegible] non-hereditary and salable [illegible] by the [illegible].

[illegible] question [illegible] the [illegible] of a temple position sold from the department [illegible] the payment for [illegible] was [illegible] could not be [illegible]. The department's [illegible] the [illegible] of the disputed office. The [illegible] but certainly did not provide [illegible]. Paragraph 74 mentions [illegible] for a [illegible] who [illegible] his office. 75 [illegible] that a priest was fined [illegible] for neglecting his duties, [illegible] 76 explained that a [illegible] was entitled to one fifth of all temple [illegible].

The [illegible] had [illegible] cases of ecclesiastical impropriety liable to a fine. [illegible] of the department [illegible] this function would be [illegible]. The [illegible] if the [illegible] assessed [illegible] are regarded as regular income derived from ecclesiastical [illegible]. [illegible] the period of the [illegible], the department already had an interest in one type of such revenue — the payments for ordination and for non-hereditary temple positions. These payments were

non-annual and non-recurring and were also [illegible] and reoccupied. Another source of income, the payment to [illegible] suggested in Chapter Two to explain the [illegible] could be classified as a non-regular ecclesiastical payment with which the department was already involved by the time of Hadrian. By the [illegible] administrative aspects of temple activity [illegible] beginning of the second century [illegible] The limitations and privileges of temple [illegible] sales agent in this respect was dealt with [illegible] temple income. Apparently during the reign of Hadrian the department was assigned to explore [illegible] even though a given case might have [illegible]

Whatever the administrative norms, the [illegible] judge and director of investigations [illegible] significance of this was [illegible] The change in administration [illegible] implied above a shift in [illegible] With the [illegible] irregular interests, the [illegible] ordinary problems of the ecclesiastical administration. To this office [illegible] assigned the task which must have been a [illegible] investigating and judging cases [illegible] of government property. The important innovation was that [illegible] concern, directly or indirectly, [illegible] order that the department have [illegible]

We might postulate the [illegible] department's interest in temple [illegible] temple affairs that was suggested in Chapter Two as the proper role of the administration of government property. The ecclesiastical administration controlled the most important and the most profitable [illegible] temple life but ecclesiastical affairs were [illegible] The local authorities in filling all important temple posts [illegible] outside of the ecclesiastical establishment. The establishment, even if the archereis or priests were sympathetic, [illegible] unity of purpose that it could become politically [illegible] of the idiosyncrasies. Although the department was not [illegible] imperial judge in deciding who was [illegible] was a non-ecclesiastical authority whose interests were [illegible] the fisc than for the well-being of the temple. Through [illegible] still have been able to exercise a great deal [illegible] perhaps manipulate the ecclesiastical establishment [illegible]

exclusive control of the temple [illegible] to no one department of the Roman administration of Egypt.

To the idios logos the temple affairs with [illegible] jurisdiction was yet another part of its general administration. As far as our evidence goes there was no [illegible] [illegible] the department [illegible] exclusively [illegible] [illegible] matters. [illegible] pertaining to temples [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] with other departmental [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. The fact that a separate [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] should be [illegible] as a [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Roman administration [illegible] the department. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of this chapter the department [illegible] with the temple [illegible] [illegible] was closely [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of the Roman administration of Egypt.

[illegible] [illegible] paragraphs [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] general information regarding the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of certain individuals to hold [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] gathered from the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] department [illegible] [illegible] proper and improper [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] would be [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

The head of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of the temples [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] department [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] temple affairs as well as [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the head of the idios logos [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] with the department [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the high priest. [illegible] we have [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] in the preceding pages [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. The department's [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] rather [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] as whether the government [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] whether any [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] should be [illegible], whether someone should pay a fine [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].[1]

2. INHERITANCE, CIVIL STATUS, AND PRIVILEGES

It was suggested in Chapter Two that a substantial portion of the [illegible] under the control of the idios logos came from the non-productive assets of

[1] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Appendix
[illegible] [illegible]

intestate estates. P. Oxy. 2277, one of the Oxyrhynchus petitions addressed to Septimius Sabinus, indicated that ownerless empty lots were among the properties listed in the Julio-Claudian *gnomon* as immediately assignable to the *idion logos*. δόξαντος αὐτοῦ τῶν ἐπὶ Κάσσ[ιο] καὶ Σαβείνου [γνώμ]ων τὰ γενόμενα. Any empty lot that was part of an intestate estate to which there was no apparent heir would fit this definition and would be appropriable to the department. Since the Augustan *idion logos* does not appear to have been endowed with general appropriating or confiscatory powers (the exceptions noted in the Augustan provisions were probably proprietorially restricted to certain specified beneficiaries), disputes about ownership involving the presumptive claims of the state to an estate or to valuable property would have come under the jurisdiction of the prefect. This is admittedly a tentative interpretation of the department's competence, a conclusion based primarily on the above-noted evidence indicating that the Augustan *idion logos* was concerned with problematic properties. Such a restricted scope of the department's prerogatives could be readily upset in paragraph 1 of the decree. Its provisions appear to have been framed to have application to any case of the *idion logos* where questions involving the legal competence of the children or members of a household other than the head of the household were at issue. Septimius Sabinus' similar case-decision in Septimius Sabinus' and Nonius Datus' dispute, because Nonius was also a minor and the property was claimed also by Domitia in paragraph 30, was most probably cited in the Nonius-Datus Papyrus.[1]

Legislation to adapt the department to the changed circumstances of the Julio-Claudian and Flavian periods was also necessary to resolve problems in inheritance. The evidence of the decree on the following pages discusses the apparent legal development of the department's competence in this area. The basis of interest in such problems appears to have been the department's immediate appropriation of the property of intestates, which presumably included all inheritances in which the prefect's representatives considered that a claim could be made. The department's involvement in such disputes was not always successful. In contentious cases the department's representatives were frequently unable to establish the claims of the state to the disputed estate. The final stage of the procedure, the appearance of the department before the tribunal of the emperor, was a lengthy and public process in which the claims of the department's governing and status interests, which were at stake, were presented and argued in court before the emperor and his assessors.

[1] Nonius Datus' claim to the property of Septimius Sabinus' mother, Domitia Lucilla, was based on the fact that she was the daughter of Nonius Datus and Domitia Lucilla. Nonius Datus' claim to the property of Septimius Sabinus' mother, Domitia Lucilla, was based on the fact that she was the daughter of Nonius Datus and Domitia Lucilla.

Paragraph 4 of the fragment of the *Idios Logos* provides the basis for the second-century department's role in the complex problems of inheritance [τῶν [κλ]ηρονομι[ῶν] ἀναδεκτῶν] εἰς οὐδένα τόπον. Ἀλλὰ κατὰ μηδεὶς κληρονομήσῃ τὰ ἐκείνῳ προσήκοντα. Intestate estates without legal heirs had been confiscated since the principate of Augustus. By the reign of Hadrian, however, all government claims based on the provisions of paragraph 4 of the fragment were protected and secured by the new logos. As the chief prosecutor and final judge in government claims, the *idios logos* was responsible for appropriating property that would not remain within an administrative unit. A very considerable proportion of the landed property was turned over, under one or the other of the several centuries' successive agency ways, to the *idios logos* and leased. The department retained control over that property which had been under its jurisdiction in the Julio-Claudian period. The documents offer no precise date for the expansion of the department's judicial capacities beyond the limitations of its Augustan functions, to include all matters involving the government's right to intestate or improperly willed property. Most of the fragments evidence it in Hadrian or later.

The function of the department's role as hereditary master is only sparsely documented. Appropriations of intestate or improperly willed estates without full 'legal' heirs were negotiated through the local administration and were, no doubt, regularly reported to the *idios logos* in Alexandria. Wills, assets, and inheritances were reported to the *idios logos* and property claimed by the appropriate agency by officials in the city. Two papyri in the Kaiserreichsinventar show how the patterns of these estates remaining within the administration and the *idios logos* were handled. *P. Mich.* 216 (ca. 138–139) reports the proceedings in the Delphinion for Marcus Antonius (A.D. 132/133) from a certain Valeria for property once belonging to Sempronia Demetrias, who had been murdered. The sum of 99 drachmas and 3 obols was recorded to the *idios logos* (line 167). In the same roll, records of the department for the previous year (recorded by this same centurion Apollonius) show all or part of several estates, including some properties and an outstanding note for which there must have been no legal heirs, were confiscated to the government. The property was sold through the *idios logos*, which was also responsible for collecting the proceeds of the loan and seeing to it that the payments to public treasuries were deposited in the banks.

The papyri, moreover, relate the complex problems with which the *idios logos* had to contend as investigation and redistribution of government claims to inheritance did not always proceed smoothly. Hearings at which the *idios logos* was represented concerned the confiscations of the landed heirs to the estate of Sempronia Demetrias, who had been murdered (*P. Mich.* 221) and who may well be the same person to whose estate was terminated in the Kaiserreichsinventar. One of the heirs with whom the hearing was held was concerned with our title. Meyer, comparing *P. Mich.* 221 with *P. Oxy.* 1034, has suggested that the Procurator of these two Berber tribes may be identified with the Procurator of the Nubian

BGU 968, who in turn was probably the unnamed ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς περὶ τῶν ἰδίων λόγων in line 1 of the same papyrus.[39] Pestman in *Mél. Préaux* (1972) quite clearly established the department's concern in the case:

> ἐγὼ δ' ἀναφορὰν ἐκδοῦναι οὐκ ἔσχον, ἀεὶ δὲ πρὸς τὸν Ἀρχιερέα ἐπορεύου πρὸς τὸν ἀφορισμόν. διὰ τῆς ἀνάγκης ταύτης ἐφεστῶτος τὸ ἐπιστόλιον διὰ τοῦτο πολλάκις ἠθέλησα τὸν ἀφορισμὸν ἀναβιβάσαι διὰ τοῦ ἐπιστολίου τῆς ἀφορμῆς ἢ τῆς τοῦ [ὠ]νουμένου.[40]

In A.D. 104 or 105 Julius Sarapion heard a case concerning an inheritance left by a Greek to a woman who had divorced her husband.[41] Paragraph 1 of the [illegible] Sarapion was probably head of the division. The purpose of the hearing was most likely to determine whether or not the woman had divorced in accord with the terms of the will, consequently, whether the government could claim the inheritance in question.

The ideal process was not reached [illegible] but was required from time to time to settle disputes between [illegible] as it had been during the reign of Augustus. [illegible] Nikon petitioned a certain Epimachos [illegible] A group of men also [illegible] Petaus had presented the request of the [illegible] which was ruled as their hereditary possession by the [illegible] Julius Vestinus (*BGU* 2068) records these events, but [illegible] Julius Sarapion [illegible] and his friends were the authors of the text on the stone, the pronouncement may be presumed to have been favorable to their cause.[42]

In many of the cases heard in the idios logos the department was required both to establish the government's title to an inheritance and to determine the competence of various heirs to inherit what remained of the contested estate. In

BGU 388 (= M.Chr. 91), after Postumus had determined what part of Gemellus' estate belonged to the government, he had to decide what remaining property went to the dead man's [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

matters. Although they illustrate the complexities of the problems which the bureau faced in performing its functions, they do not in any way show how the department went about its business of investigating and adjudicating such matters. Information was provided by the emperor and his advisers, deciding a case might require the appointment of a special board of the idus logae, or the idus might be used. Since the board of five might establish a precedent to be followed in future cases, Pliny (Ep. 10.58.1) felt that the department was never the legislator of the laws and regulations which it was required to consult in rendering a verdict. These principles in general, and for that matter the rest of the system, remained unchanged throughout the administrative year.

The department became thoroughly familiar with the problems of legal status as they affected testamentary and intestacy matters, and it was given jurisdiction over appointments of curators and tutors. Senatorial and imperial ordinances regulating the rights of [illegible] children and the effects and procedures of persons [illegible] also fell within the department's purview. [illegible] military service and registration [illegible] and the department had to investigate [illegible] and inheritance cases brought under the [illegible] the department must also [illegible] investigations into [illegible] In some cases, however, the [illegible] were [illegible]

The case of Mucius [illegible] brought before the [illegible] consuls [illegible] the department [illegible] hearings before [illegible] September. After [illegible] the [illegible] claimed [illegible] Pliny [illegible] precedents were [illegible] Julianus[14] was [illegible] that she had [illegible] Although [illegible] matter should [illegible] truly [illegible] he was required [illegible] Accordingly [illegible] Accordingly [illegible] which he gave [illegible] number of [illegible] consequently might [illegible] military service but had to [illegible]

14. [illegible]
15. [illegible]

after his discharge. Johannes, then, before issuing a verdict for the case before him, was required to give an opinion on the legitimacy of a military marriage and to establish whether or when a dissolution of such a marriage had taken place.

The *Decrees of the Alexandrian Gymnasium* indicates quite clearly that the idios logos during the second century had jurisdiction over matters which relate only in a secondary way to problems of inheritance. Paragraphs 41 and 117[1] call for the confiscation and deposit of the estate of anyone who rears a child *ex konseos*. The penalty in these sections affects the testamentary capacity of the guilty party and sets a time limit for the collection. Paragraph 91 informs the user of the *Decrees* that the son of a Roman and an Egyptian was taxed a fixed sum because he married an Egyptian. The model marriage would obviously have some bearing on the disposition of the parties and any offspring to bequeath and inherit, but was by no means liable to immediate test. The idios logos was furthermore in charge of enforcing through its orders the various regulations affecting the children and property of [illegible]. Thus paragraph 29, which states that an unmarried Jew born [illegible] was exempt from the poll tax, but that a Jew who had failed to pay the personal tax on the fifteen months preceding [illegible] was liable to immediate payment of the tax, implies a consistent reference for any department head to whom such a case was presented.

The illegal registration of [illegible] called for the confiscation of one-fourth of the property of the party father and illegally registered son. The final authority in such a case was the idios logos. As in all cases the department had jurisdiction over all illegal registrations but when the [illegible] was imposed the matter had to be referred to the [illegible] court, including the Alexandrian epikrisis. Incidental paragraphs [illegible] 50, and 58[2] may be viewed as information supplementary to the paragraphs that have a more direct relation to the department's concern for problems of inheritance. In particular, however, they detail the complicated class structure of Roman Egypt, the continuation of which was the function of the idios logos acting as investigator and judge.

The expanding administrative role of the idios logos as judge and investigator may be summarized in the following scheme:

1. [illegible] declared ἐπὶ ἴδιον λόγον ἀναληφθέντα κατὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα [illegible] or contested estates in which there was a possibility of a government claim.
2. [illegible] ἐπὶ ἴδιον λόγον ἀναληφθέντα from the [illegible].
3. All questions of inheritance, even when the government clearly had no claim to part of the deposited legacy.
4. All [illegible] affecting civil status liable to immediate or posthumous penalty [illegible] immediately altering the guilty party's testamentary or hereditary competence.

The documents clearly imply both a progression by which the department eventually received control over problems in each status. Each succeeding stage

implies the preceding, e.g. jurisdiction over civil disputes involving a legacy was probably not assigned to the idios logos before the department was investigating government claims to intestate estates. But the sequence may not have stretched over any long period of time. It is possible that the entire sequence was effected during the reign of Augustus, and that the lack of evidence for the department's involvement in every aspect of the scheme during the Julio-Claudian period is entirely fortuitous.

It, however, it is not just chance that the verdicts of Isaac the Rector, the praefect and Cyprus Ashlegrader, the united States, et cet preceded the verdict of Johanan in 58 Be. 573, and if the lack of pre-Flavian and even pre-Hadrianic evidence is not accidental, the changes in the department's procedure must have come in stages. Expansion over a period of time is not unreasonable. The experience gained at one stage would prepare the way for the next.[20] At some point when the idios logos had become well versed in the department's claims to intestate estates, and when the praefect had established the precedent initiating imperial policy, the bureau was designated as the most convenient agency for protecting and advancing the government's interests in intestacies. The change would have been neither dramatic nor unplanned. Once a decision was reached, a transfer of jurisdiction to Alexandria would have had every appearance of routine. The praefect, the strategos and the epistrategos [illegible] would refer to the idios logos for guidance and the usual documents would flow to the praefect or subordinates of course the department's administrative structure was appropriately altered in that an additional [illegible] was created to make a distinction between such property as could be [illegible] the government's claims within the department's administration and such properties as were only converted into coin and sent to the appropriate agency. The cash assets of an estate wholly or partly [illegible] as the result of a hearing in the idios logos were deposited immediately [illegible].

The assignment of all problems of inheritance and then all cases involving civil status to the jurisdiction of the idios logos probably followed the same general pattern. The assignment came because the idios logos was familiar both with the intricacies of the next level of jurisdiction and with the precedents established by the authority which had previously been responsible for the cases now being assigned to it. In A.D. 136 Johanan could consult the opinions of the praefect and archidikastes who had issued verdicts in cases analogous to the one that he was deciding.

It is easy to see then that the evidence fits a view of the development of the idios logos that suggests an evolution over some time. But there is greater

20 Seppius Rufus and Julius Frontinus, while investigating property appropriated to the idios logos in the first century probably discovered properties which were in private hands belonging to the department's administration but also to property which should have been classified as royal land.

difficulty in suggesting dates for the stages of the development. The papyri and the *Gnomon* can supply a *terminus post quem*, but in so doing inform us only that the department was definitely engaged in a specific function at a particular date. The *Gnomon* statement that the jurisdiction over the Alexandrian *epikrisis* was transferred to the prefect is sufficient warning that the department did not always maintain control over every type of case assigned to it. Circumstantial evidence, however, offers an appealing argument for a Hadrianic completion of the scheme suggested above, and perhaps a Hadrianic origin for the last two phases of the sequence.

We may first observe an analogy between the department's jurisdiction over ritual improprieties and its jurisdiction over violations in civil status. In each capacity the *idios logos* was acting exclusively as an investigator and judge, since neither type of infraction involved property potentially appropriable to the department's administration. The earliest documented date for the department's role in "liturgical improprieties" is Hadrian's 7th year, A.D. 122/123, when Pakysis was determined to forfeit Pardalas for having offered an improperly sealed bullock (*BGU* 2201). The first appearance of the *idios logos* as judge for violations of the rules regulating civil status is in paragraph 24.1 of the *Gnomon*, where the same Pardalas is mentioned as having confiscated the property of a woman who had married [illegible]. It is certainly not unlikely that the *idios logos* was at the same time assigned jurisdiction over both types of infraction. Interestingly enough, Julius Pardalas is also the last datable head of the *idios logos*, to whom a dispute over a legacy which the government had received upon intestacy was referred in May 138. The role of the *idios logos* is now striking to be credited exclusively to Hadrian, and strongly suggests that it was during the reign of Hadrian that the department had become responsible for matters pertaining only remotely to its original administrative function.[21]

On the basis of the evidence now available, it is reasonable to accept the view that before the reign of Hadrian the jurisdiction of the *idios logos* was limited to those cases involving property immediately appropriable to the department or to some other government agency. During that reign that changed, and the jurisdiction of the *idios logos* was expanded to deal with complicated violations of ecclesiastical procedure, and dealt with the laws concerning civil status.[22]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1. The Idius Logos as Investigating Agent, Investigation and Judge

None of the documented actions of the pre Flavian *idios logos* involved confiscation in the strict sense. Private ownership of the property appropriable directly to the [illegible] department had never been the *idios logos* became involved. Its appropriation powers were limited to the productive *adespota* and were activated only after [illegible] By the time the situation had changed [illegible] the *idios logos* [illegible] authority [illegible] or to some other agency, and was not [illegible] property appropriated [illegible] agent. Individuals or groups were being deprived of their property by the *idios logos*

It is not surprising therefore, [illegible] department was the [illegible] dominant. The confiscation [illegible] effected by the department. The [illegible] regarded as major [illegible] with the problems [illegible] pregained the way for the [illegible] an offender who had [illegible] received a name from the [illegible] same fashion.

Continuing [illegible] considerations. [illegible] except certain [illegible] Graeco-Roman [illegible] pardon-tombs [illegible] continued from [illegible] were well-[illegible]

In the preceding [illegible] *idios logos* had [illegible] competence [illegible] old capacity as [illegible] capacity as [illegible] first confiscations [illegible] own presidency [illegible] that knew how [illegible] confiscating [illegible] *Idios logos* had [illegible] dominators in matters beyond its [illegible]

[illegible] has acted by virtue of its role as conciliator, not as investigator and judge.

[illegible] the [illegible] with [illegible] and [illegible] which could [illegible] The [illegible] that the department's [illegible] the [illegible] period [illegible] administrative [illegible] The [illegible] the [illegible] regulating [illegible] the [illegible] points of [illegible]

The [illegible] during the second century [illegible] practices in business and [illegible] the [illegible] administrative [illegible] the [illegible] affecting the department's [illegible] which have a bearing on the bureau's administration [illegible] all or some of the property [illegible][22] Violations of [illegible] were [illegible] and were liable to definite [illegible] Paragraphs 98–101 [illegible] of the improper [illegible] Paragraph [illegible] talents for the illegal [illegible] Paragraphs [illegible] commodity [illegible] the illegal exchange of money. [illegible] understandable only if the department's [illegible] against the [illegible] described [illegible] were not within the department's [illegible]

Paragraph [illegible] that it was a matter of [illegible] and [illegible] those who departed by sea without [illegible] was transferred from the [illegible] to the prefect. The assignment or reassignment of the function to the prefect [illegible] have been quite [illegible] to the composition of the

22. The [illegible] of the [illegible] appears [illegible] to [illegible] property [illegible] and [illegible]

23. The department was [illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible] to the extent that they affected an individual's capacity [illegible] not have been concerned with [illegible] whether or not the [illegible] connection with the department. See note 21 above.

extant Gnomon. For the fines in paragraphs 64 and 65, [illegible], the fines suggested for [illegible] against the passport law. Paragraphs 66, 67 and 69 quote penalties for the illegal exportation of slaves.

The concluding paragraphs of the Gnomon reveal the idios logos as investigator and judge in such miscellaneous cases as membership in certain guilds (108), illegal purchases by [illegible] and [illegible] in military service (109-111). The final fragments may pertain to the department's judicial capacities. However, paragraph [illegible] the [illegible] administrative capacity of [illegible] and [illegible] of the [illegible].

Of the many [illegible] in which the department functioned as investigator and judge, [illegible] illustrated by a document other than the Gnomon. Paragraph [illegible] that the idios logos was [illegible] that Romans were allowed by Hadrian to [illegible] the implication being that the department was [illegible] Romans [illegible] [illegible][illegible] [illegible] to deal with such matters.[illegible] The text, which may have been inscribed [illegible] followed by a description of events affecting the [illegible] in the declaration. The [illegible] M. Mettius Rufus was [illegible] Rufus, with an application in which he charged that a [illegible] had been sold illegally. The matter was [illegible].[illegible] The text, fragmentary though it is, gives the [illegible] raised by Claudius [illegible]. The text ends with a reference to one Marcus Mettius Rufus.

[illegible]

who had inherited from one Pompeius Epaphras.[28] The connection of this transaction with the *Gnomon* is easy to see. In lines [illegible] of the text we find that the matter is turned over to the idios logos, and paragraph 2 of the *Gnomon* specifically states that sales of non-negotiable tombs by Romans were, prior to a ruling issued by Hadrian, illegal. The concern of the idios logos for such matters should perhaps be seen as originating ca. A.D. [illegible] or shortly before. Claudius Geminus would then be hearing the case as a routine matter within his jurisdiction.

This interpretation of the affair does not, however, account for Munatius Rufus, whose inheritance from Pompeius does not necessarily involve the garden tomb. If he had inherited the tomb, a more emphatic statement of the fact should be expected. We have no clue about the character of the legacy other than that the inheritance made it possible for Munatius [illegible] (line 20). Although he was not necessarily an heir to the tomb, or perhaps in addition to being an heir, Munatius had assumed the duty to watch over the tomb and work the garden. He was [illegible] keeper. By analogy with the [illegible] in P. Oxy. [illegible][29] we might speculate that Munatius had inherited a [illegible] or some other such expression.

Munatius Rufus as keeper immediately brings to mind [ ] Rufus the keeper who denounced the illegal sale of Roberts' inscription.[30] [illegible] line 7 is acceptable, the actions described in the inscription become a bit clearer. If the identification is correct, it is probable that Munatius was responsible for erecting the inscription which was narrated, for purposes of [illegible] in the third person.

As hereditary keeper, Munatius' position would definitely have been threatened by the illegal sale. The garden that he was working was quite obviously the object of the sale, for the culprits had tried to disguise the sale as a lease, and

28. The [illegible] subordinate [illegible] were [illegible] Pompeius Epaphras [illegible] The three [illegible] [illegible]

29. See above p. [illegible].

30. [illegible] 1959, pp. [illegible] Typographically, the reading is [illegible] in the margin [illegible] line 18 and [illegible] line 21.

there would certainly have been no profit for a lessee in renting a tomb without the right to work the garden. There is no information given about the relationship of the would-be sellers to the garden tomb. It may be that the [illegible] here, like the [illegible] in [illegible], did not, apparently, include ownership.[11] Perhaps, then, [illegible] Epaphras while leaving the garden tomb to the eventual culprits, willed the [illegible] of the same tomb to Mummius. The garden tomb was therefore a source of profit to Mummius alone. The heirs could not lease it, since Mummius was entitled to the produce. They could not sell the garden, for the garden tomb was [illegible] and any sale of the garden would by the conditions of the dedication include the sale of a [illegible] tomb, which was illegal. Even worse, the [illegible] of the garden tomb would [illegible] the sale [illegible] which clearly belonged to the [illegible]. The heirs, if they were direct descendants of the persons [illegible] might have the right of burial in the tomb, but there was no [illegible] profit in that.

The attempted sale was [illegible] by [illegible]. The accused pleaded that the transaction was a lease, [illegible] Mummius, was a [illegible] dispute. [illegible] pleaded [illegible] that they had sold only the garden. [illegible] the garden tomb was [illegible] stated that they [illegible]. He accordingly [illegible]. The [illegible] does not reveal whether or not he demanded a [illegible] who was implicated in the matter by [illegible] was [illegible] liable for the [illegible] of the [illegible]. Whether the [illegible] were part of the sales price or a penalty is not stated.

In the final analysis it is difficult to [illegible] the [illegible] of the idios logos' [illegible] in this case. [illegible] jurisdiction over the sale of [illegible] tomb [illegible] the beginning of the department's [illegible] to about A.D. [illegible]. There is no [illegible] possible government claim. The [illegible] that the affair is not [illegible] the [illegible] details of the hearing were recorded, and they are badly [illegible]. We do not know the full [illegible] which may have been complete [illegible] Germanus. The [illegible] of the [illegible] wanted the reader to realize only that those who had tried to sell the garden tomb [illegible].

The idios logos had been [illegible] century [illegible] before the time of Septimius Severus [illegible] investigating and passing verdicts on illegal

11. The [illegible] [illegible]

occupation of property under its administrative control, the department had become familiar with the avenues through which information and evidence were gathered. As the department established a routine that probably paralleled the practice of [illegible] A. Hirsh, the new commissioner, a well-known investigator and judge of matters affecting administration, found delays finding out the city were making. Although [illegible] contributed to the department's medical [illegible] matters connected with administration necessitated [illegible] major [illegible]. The additional requisite was knowledge of the laws with which the department already possessed. But for which in its new capacity it became [illegible]. An abstract of precedents established by the prefect and other officials who had decided cases similar to those now under the department's [illegible] would have been very convenient. Whatever else the [illegible] of the Blue Book may be, it certainly is much a digest of laws and precedents designed to aid the head of the department and those acting on the department's behalf in reaching verdicts in cases accepted by the department's jurisdiction.

It is most probable that once the department began investigating and judging cases that were in no way connected with its administrative functions, it investigated matters pertaining to those same functions in its most secret capacity. Thus [illegible] whose case was heard by the department that managed the property which he had illegally occupied, would in these early days have had his case heard by the same [illegible] investigation and judge. The role of investigator and judge [illegible] a function of the department as distinct from the department's administrative apparatus or its role as [illegible].

As the final authority for enforcement of the laws and ordinances regulating civil, [illegible] social, business and financial activity the department played an important role in the life of second century Egypt. Improper registration of birth and improper [illegible] of death were objects of investigation. The illegal marriage of the soldier Rufus to the Jewess Egyptian was potentially liable to a penalty from the department. In brief, the department provided for the many facets of private and public life with which the ordinances were directly concerned and for which it would as a possible investigator, judge, or [illegible].

Although the department's competence in investigation, study and confirmation [illegible] well without [illegible] was [illegible] aspect of government property [illegible] added nothing to the bureau's administrative responsibilities. The department heard cases involving illegal [illegible] marriages, [illegible], passports etc., it essentially had no further connection with managing registrations, issuing marriage licenses or recording marriages, prescribing proper rituals or issuing passports. There is one exception.

32 See above pp. 43-49

In A.D. 194, one Eudaemon requested permission from Claudius Apollonius ὁ πρὸς τῷ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ to [illegible] the names of his Egyptian parents (BGU [illegible]). A condition of the change was that Eudaemon be free of public and private debts. The petition was approved and officials in the [illegible] were accordingly informed. The idios logos had jurisdiction over improper designation in public and private documents [illegible] paragraph 42 [illegible] confiscation of one-fourth of the property of the guilty party and of all those who knowingly concurred. It is, therefore, [illegible] that the department processed requests for changes [illegible] although the [illegible] attested by [illegible] the Gnomon. The idios logos was indeed the final interpreter of any law applicable to a case within its jurisdiction, but certainly was neither legislator nor promulgator of those laws, nor was it as a general rule responsible for the administrative procedures stipulated by the rules and ordinances for which it was the final authority.

4. THE IDIOS LOGOS AS ADMINISTRATOR OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Popular knowledge of the idios logos must have stemmed primarily from the department's role as confiscator, investigator and judge. It was in these capacities that the department came into contact with the general population and [illegible] generally viewed [illegible]. By the middle of the second century the popular [illegible] the distinction between ὁ πρὸς τῷ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ and [illegible] the head of the idios logos controlled and directed all the confiscatory and judicial powers assigned to the idios logos. When [illegible] the head of the idios logos pronounced a verdict for the idios logos, the verdict was [illegible] of the idios logos. These functions, independent as they were of the department's administrative activity, rendered the bureaucratic distinction between idios logos and the department's chief meaningless.

Although confiscating, investigating and passing verdicts were the most prominent activities of the idios logos, the department nevertheless continued to maintain control over certain types of government property. There are enough surviving second-century documents [illegible] adequately that the department was [illegible] and that it was still responsible for [illegible] property as the dead [illegible] indicating that at some point during the second century the department [illegible] to other government agencies [illegible] properties [illegible] for the [illegible] control over all properties [illegible] no matter what their status, [illegible] In the first century the administration [illegible] and selling [illegible] In the second century [illegible]

property, the department was obliged to lease much of the land that it acquired by virtue of its confiscating powers. Along with this new responsibility came the business of a renting agent, collecting rents on urban land, accounting for the various fees extracted from successful litigating suits, and confiscating the income from rented property for a tenant's failure to meet his financial obligations to the department.[3]

The duties of the government's chief agents for supervising government land in the second century, while at the same time giving a similar function to certain municipal officials in the matter of administrative competence, to rent and sell property for it is probable that any property confiscated because of debts to the department was generally rented by the dioiketes to be administered in the most appropriate fashion.

With the expansion of the administrative responsibilities of the dioiketes, the flow of information passing into the Alexandrian office became a deluge. It is often difficult for us to distinguish among the communiqués regarding ad quaestra agenda those which were merely routine records of individual departmental business. But even a passing glance at these reports demonstrates the amount of activity in the department required by assignments to the dioiketes in Alexandria.

As in the last century, the department continued to split the regular bureaucratic procedure into the normal functions of the subordinate local secretaries who were responsible for sending weekly reports to the department and were exclusively responsible for their accuracy. The success of the department's bureaucratic obligations apparently rested on the basis of the staff of local secretaries, rather than on the dioiketes' staff in Alexandria, which evidently assigned personnel to check the reports of the local secretaries.

The role of the department's auditors must have been a fairly routine matter by the end of the 1st century A.D. Periodically, the auditors would visit the various provinces to check the accounts of the local secretaries. Here they would take testimony from the various officials and citizens of the area concerned with the case. Such a case is found in Alexandria concerning a building loan that had been guaranteed by the property of [illegible] and [illegible]. There seems to be some question about how the loan was originally obtained, whether the head of the department was personally involved in making it. Another document [illegible] The department of finance also took control of the property [illegible] and its disposition and judge. The case [illegible] property was belonging to the murdered Serapammon [illegible] was recorded at Rome in the [illegible] P. Mich. 224 (A.D. [illegible]). As we have seen in [illegible] above, at this [illegible] the department similarly [illegible] agents to provide officers

P. Grad. 118 illustrates much of the same [illegible] involved in the administration of Julius Alexander, which the dioiketes had [illegible] since the beginning of Roman rule in Egypt. The papyrus [illegible] the reply of a duke overseer to an [illegible] from the dioiketes concerning the overseer's alleged failure to recover some fallen trees. The case against the man developed as follows

1. The records of Mecheir, A.D. 140, pertaining to τὰ ἀπέκοντα τῷ ἴδιῳ λόγῳ reported that several trees had fallen along the dikes around Teis; the trees were duly registered under oath by the komogrammateus and were subsequently sold.

2. It was later discovered that the overseers of the dikes had not registered the trees, and the department ordered an investigation.

3. The matter came up in the conventus of 148, before Claudius Justus, who was then head of the idios logos; at that time the above information was introduced, but the matter was referred back to the nome strategos (*P. Mich.* 129 recto col. 2) for the investigation.

4. Theon, the peripolarch dike overseer, wrote an oath in reply to the order that it was not customary for dike overseers to register fallen trees.

The department was responsible for recording ownerless land and correspondingly an investigator and judge was required to investigate the failure to register such land. The registered trees were reported regularly to the department in Alexandria. It is significant that in Theon's case the idios logos was not interested so much in tracing missing trees that belonged to the administration (they had already been reported), as it was in bringing Theon to justice in his capacity as investigator and judge of such infractions as were charged against the dike overseer.

Theon's case, although it was closely connected with the idios logos as administrator over ownerless trees, illustrates the distinction between the department's administrative and judicial functions. The latter were subordinate to the former, and the idios logos had been interested only in administrative efficiency, the case against Theon would probably never have developed. The trees had not only been registered, but had been properly sold. However, as investigator and judge, the idios logos sought to bring to justice a man who allegedly committed a procedural error eight years before the department had taken up the case.

Theon was not alone in his difficulties. He was only one of the many cases that filled at least two rolls of the department's ration for investigations. The idios logos was constantly taking servants to task in investigations.

Routine registrations have survived in *P. Yale* inv. 299 and *BGU* 1 342. The Yale papyrus is a copy of a list of trees which had fallen in a storm. The exact measurement of every tree was recorded, and, it would seem, every twig was listed when available. The department was exposed to similar lists.

A sufficient explanation for much of the evidence touching on the administrative competence of the idios logos may be had only by assuming that the department had control over property other than ownerless property. Many of the entries in our lists and many of the reports sent to the bureau in Alexandria show that the idios logos had become a repository for productive property which must be, therefore, understood as part of the department's

administrative responsibility. Unfortunately, the general conclusion that the idios logos maintained control over all property confiscated as a penalty assessed by it or appropriated to the government through the department in its capacity as confiscator is never specifically demonstrated in the documents. The Greeks never speaks of a confiscation *tō(i) idiōi logōi*, but usually designates the fiscus whichever it mentions a receiver. Furthermore, Claudius Julianus in *SBKlio*. 372 Col. 6 provides an immediate qualification for such a generality in his ordering that any slave that was part of the intestate estate of Acutianus be remanded to the [illegible] logos, over which the idios logos does not appear to have had control in A.D. 316. A second and perhaps more immediate qualification is that 20 money confiscated through the idios logos was, quite naturally, deposited to the fiscus. Nevertheless, some productive property did remain under the department's control and was rented rather than sold.

A tax roll from Theadelphia, *BGU* 1894, in *SBKlio*. 357 credited to the idios logos payments from the following sources (lines 79-91):

1. [illegible] *apo(?) Hypsiou dr(achmai)*
2. [illegible] *apo(?) Hespeias*
3. *epostolou (sequestrum)*
4. *phoro(u) kourkas kat(a) k(ōmēn)*
5. *phoro(u) g(ēs)*
6. *te(lōnikou) (?) (drachmai)*
7. *ton(ou) tōn(?) (drachmai)*

The ecclesiastical payments 1 and 2 are readily assignable to the idios logos. 1 and 2 are probably payments for certain privileges and 6 is the installation fee for a priesthood. The reference to the sale of property, 7, may indicate that the idios logos was handling monies from sales of property which it held. The rest of the payments, however, are from arable property. Number 3 represents the income from sequestered property which the department might have been holding until a tenant could be found. The reason for the sequestration may have been the failure of the tenant to pay his rent. Numbers 4 and 5 are payments for arable garden land which was evidently being rented from the idios logos. That the idios logos had not become the sole agent responsible for these fees is proved in the same tax list. The garden taxes are credited also to the dioiketai in line 32 as is, strangely enough, the disposal of the price of property in line 42. Moreover the oneiakos logos, still in the same tax roll, was assigned a payment from the income of sequestered property (line 111), and in the tax for planting (line 139). Thus the waters of Nile credited to the idios logos with the exception of those received from ecclesiastical sources were also credited to the oneiakos logos and the dioiketai. The department had usurped the prerogative of neither, nor had it become the administrator of the other agencies. The idios logos was evidently engaged in the same activity as the dioiketai and the oneiakos logos.

Similar listings may be found in many other tax rolls (*P. Col.* [illegible] 69 records a payment to the account of the idios logos for *apoge dyntou* in A.D. 180,

P. Mich. 223.2265, and 224.3456, but in the Karanis tax rolls for 172 and 173 a payment προσόδ(ων) ἀλογέ(δων) to the idios logos, *P. Mich.* 215.50, and *P. Tebt.* 1436.23-24, are similar entries.[31]

The department had the regular tax-gathering corps at its disposal for collecting payments in cash and in kind from the properties it was leasing. A case dates between 5 March and 3 November, when [illegible] a petition to the Memphite bouleutai, submitted a statement that he had [illegible] to deposit the [illegible] payments [illegible] the idios logos. *P. Mich.* 241. He followed his declaration with an oath and a statement of receipt. These were certainly not cash payments, due directly to the idios logos, but contributions in kind. These should have gone to the granaries of the department and been deposited immediately through the usual banker to the department. The only possible cash payments in this context are those described above as monetary rents and these must be [illegible] taxes [illegible] the idios logos.

A declaration similar to that of [illegible] was made in *P. Mich.* 238. Heron and his associates, praktores [illegible] Demetrias and Herakleides and [illegible] Alexandria [illegible] Antaiopolis [illegible] the idios logos. There was no indication of the source of the rents in the petition, which [illegible] was accounting for expenses incurred by his own agents [illegible] had been engaged in collecting payments in kind for the department, payments which must have been due from the tenants of the department's land.

These declarations not only provided the state with an administrative check also, and consequently supplied the department's judicial arm. A complete and hopeless problem would have existed in trying to register payments received by the idios logos had his case be split up at the conclusion of farmers' cheirons. The better the state's knowledge of the department's business, the better its chances of success in the department's judicial arm. A complete and hopeless problem would have existed in trying to register payments received by the idios logos had his case be split up at the conclusion of farmers' cheirons. The better the state's knowledge of the department's business, the better its chances of success in the department's judicial arm.

Chaeremon, Pontos Nigrinianos, the charge against the praktor concerned an administrative error and not a charge of defrauding the treasury. The case was continued for several years, by the praktor in 145 was to provide, on behalf in reply to an order for investigation which he addressed to [illegible] and to Satapous the bank-keeper [illegible]. The petition included copies of the receipts which he claimed to have received from Heron, the secretary to the idios logos [illegible] Chaeremon. Nothing, through a certain Satapous who was, perhaps, in charge of transferring documents to Alexandria. The alleged irregularities occurred between 136 and 139, the case received a hearing in 140 and was still pending in 151 (BGU for 151

31 For the various tax and [illegible] see P. J. Wallace, Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian, Princeton Studies in Papyrology no. 2, 1938, a list may be found in Allen Chester John- [illegible] Roman Egypt, in An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome, 1936, pp. 552-580.

Other surviving declarations show little variation in the routine outlined above. *P. Lond.* 6[9] is a statement from Heron and his associates, strategoi, delivered to Apollonius and his associates who received and transmitted accounts sent to Alexandria. In the eklogistai of the nome and to the idiologos Heron declared that of the produce of [illegible] arabing was assessed and to the idiologos from Pauni to Mesore of [illegible] remained. Panas, a hemogrammateus, declared to Balanos the strategos of the Arsinoite Nome in 196 that there was nothing pertaining to [illegible] property. *P. Lond.* 1219[1], p. 124[1]–[illegible] for 123]

[illegible] reveal the declarant as a retiring strategos apparently [illegible]. Aelius Satapous, a veteran, stated that on 5 October 193 Herodion and Maximos had petitioned [illegible] certain pieces of property [illegible] 1001 arourai the land of an estate confiscated from a certain Dionysios. The property consisted [illegible] which it was to [illegible] undertaker who agreed [illegible]

The strategos was [illegible] returning [illegible] much of the arable property [illegible] other applicants [illegible] who had had [illegible] the condemned property [illegible]. In turn the department [illegible] quite [illegible] much of the arable property as it could. It [illegible] which was [illegible] since the plots [illegible] was now required [illegible] payments and [illegible] land. Such [illegible] were [illegible] through the [illegible] gathering machinery.

The [illegible] the secretaries of the [illegible] may have [illegible] the [illegible] the department's administration we owe them [illegible] reports from the [illegible] were made [illegible] payments from [illegible] property. It seems reasonable, however, that they should also have processed information from their respective nomes about [illegible] departmental activities. *P. Lond.* 1219 [illegible] the nome strategos to the idiologos between [illegible] nomes, from which it may be [illegible] that several nomes might have been served by a single secretary at the idiologos.

The department [illegible] organization does not appear to have extended beyond the nomes. Apparently the second century saw more than it did in the first. Many [illegible] the [illegible] to the idiologos, but none [illegible] between [illegible] the [illegible] to requests to [illegible] who transmitted [illegible] to the [illegible] of the idiologos. Some of these were [illegible] the same [illegible] to other departments (e.g. Apollonios in *P. Amh.* 63), who transmitted reports both to the eklogistai of the nome and to the idiologos.

Who and when the department began to [illegible] arable property is problematic. The process [illegible] would be one of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] arable [illegible] and [illegible] throughout the [illegible]. At some point a simple [illegible] to this complex operation evolved by having the department

retain control over property so confiscated, with responsibility for selling or renting it. The only inconvenience in this administrative shift would have been the additional bureaucratic obligations that the idios logos assumed as an active participant in the regular land administration. In the first century the bureau simply sold the property which it controlled as rapidly and as profitably as possible. This land, once the sale became private property, was taken off the idios logos list and no concern either personnel or bureaucratic about it. But in the second century the department which had also become the administration for government property appropriated by the idios logos in its capacity as confiscator, was required to remit productive land, and was thus burdened with all the red tape involved.

It must be admitted that in comparison with the other agencies renting government land, especially in the Fayum, Hermopolis and Michigan tax rolls, the idios logos was not overloaded with productive land on a major scale. For instance, the census in the Arsinoite nome in the [illegible] the idios logos [illegible] extended to consider the land leased by the idios logos. Nevertheless the documents are clear in showing that the idios logos was renting [illegible].

While the idios logos was becoming a [illegible] arable land other departments were beginning to sell [illegible] property. [illegible] refers to the [illegible] and [illegible] in 184. Valerius [illegible] who began [illegible] was responsible for selling the property of the murdered [illegible]. Under [illegible] some property purchased [illegible] the [illegible] was [illegible] of the Gemellus estate had been [illegible] through the idios logos, but the [illegible] must have acted [illegible] the [illegible] the [illegible] the administration of the land [illegible] was well [illegible]. Therefore, confiscated for debts owed to the [illegible], remained within the [illegible] to [illegible] to be sold [illegible].

If this was indeed the second century situation, we expect that purchases and bequests should be made to the agency which controlled most of the [illegible]. There are, accordingly, [illegible] land to candidates the idios logos [illegible] [illegible] land [illegible] documents such as [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] impossible to ascribe it to the idios logos. But [illegible] land arrangements that was definitely managed by the [illegible], and more difficult to state with certainty that [illegible] land such as that recorded in SB 5675 was [illegible] by the idios logos unless [illegible] to [illegible] that the department controlled the land being sold. It might just as well have been royal land that had become dry [illegible] land that had been turned over to the [illegible] for detailed rent.

Although the above interpretation of the [illegible] competence of the idios logos may explain many of the documents, the department's role as controller of arable land and leasing agent does not fully account for [illegible] 590 + [illegible] 30,31.

where the department is somehow concerned with property sequestered for back rent owed to the *ouneba logoi*. The term *pempatopapolipsia* (*πεμπατοπαπολιψία*) is curious enough.[11] It never appears to describe properties confiscated from condemned criminals, but is applied exclusively, when a reason for sequestration is given, to property appropriated for failure to meet financial obligations due to a renting agency. Hence the *idios logos*, since it was leasing land, would have been involved in sequestered property as much as any other department similarly leasing government land. Such property was managed in the *chora* by officials known as *exaktores pempatopapolipseos*, who acted on behalf of the agency owed the unpaid rent for which the property was seized. They could perform duties simultaneously for the *dioiketai*, *ounebai logoi*, *idioi logoi* and were as such no different in their obligations to each department than were any other officials in the nome. They served the *dioiketai* in *P. Ryl.* 214 and 216 and in *P. Land.* 164 (= p. 115), and the *ounebai logoi* in *P. Ryl.* 76. Sequestered land in *P. Strasb.* 99 (p. 90) involved the *ounebai logoi*, and perhaps the *dioiketai* and *idioi logoi* at the same time. *P. Ryl.* 100 indicates that by 140 the local office in charge of sequestered property was titled as a *choras*. The department for which the official in *P. Mich.* VIII 466 was acting is not revealed.

Property sequestered for back rent or failure to meet other financial obligations probably accounts for the various papyrus documents dedicated to the *idioi logoi*. Unfortunately this does not explain *why*. The unwanted individual who was granted the land seized from the *ounebai logoi* had his property seized for the failure of the lessee to pay the rent. He had evidently met his obligations to the *ounebai logoi*, may be poor or otherwise [illegible] Apollonarion explanation Oxyrhynchite (see 1410), but he will have to deal with the *idioi logoi*. The restoration of the new fragment as suggested by Plaumann,[12] [illegible], may be explained in terms of the distinction we have made between the department's administrative and judicial capacities. The *idioi logoi* was involved not as the department which had final control over all sequestered property, but as local judge in such cases. Sequestered land could not be returned to its owners until their cases had been heard in the *idioi logoi* and they had established that they had cleared all of their outstanding debts. Sequestration was definitely a penalty which could be imposed by any department leasing government land, but it was a conditional one in light of Plaumann's new papyrus. This fragment, which could be removed only by the *idioi logoi*, is a purely judicial aspect.

An alternate explanation might be that this same property was given as surety for land simultaneously rented from the *idioi logoi* and, as such, for the same lessee's failure to pay rent to the *idioi logoi*, it was placed in [illegible]

11. Wilcken, *Ostr.* I, 1937, p. 441; *P. Lond.* III 1171 (p. 97).

12. Plaumann, p. 30.

γενηματογραφία (line 18) the income from it to be proportionately divided between the idios logos and *ousiakos logos*. The guarantor, having met his obligations to the *ousiakos logos*, was owed, in the *idios logos* but failed to prove conclusively (μη ἀποδείξαντος 19), that he had removed the debt owed the *idios logos*. The head of the *idios logos*, Pertinax,[34] wrote to the strategos of the Arsinoite Nome that one under bond (ὑπεύθυνος) to him was to be allowed to receive the land—otherwise it should remain sequestered, even though he had paid his debt to the *ousiakos logos*.[35]

Hence, the appeals concerning sequestered lands in the income from them referred to the *idios logos*, such as *P. Lond.* 2 (*Wilcken Chr.* 439) and *P. Oxy.* XIII. 21, can be explained in terms of the department's interest either as administrator of productive property or as judge in such matters. There is certainly no need for placing all such sequestered property, for that matter the *dioikesis* and *ousiakos logos*, under the control of the *idios logos*.

V. THE ORGANIZATION OF THE *IDIOS LOGOS*

Τοῦτο γ[ραφομένης] δὲ ἐν [τῷ] ἐμφανε[στάτῳ] τῶν ἀπὸ [τοῦ]
ἐπιτροπ[εύοντος] ἐπιβεβηκότος καὶ τῶν ἐπιτηρητῶν [τοῦ]
κ[α]τ' ἐκεῖνον γενομένου ἐξουσιαστοῦ καὶ [τοῦ] ἐπὶ τῆς
[τοῦ] ἰδίου λογ[ικοῦ] ἐπιστατοῦντος ἐπιτρόπου καὶ
ἐπιτη[ρ]ητ[ῶν] ἐκείνου καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς [τοῦ] κ[υρίου]
κ[αὶ] ἀντιγρ[αφείου] ἀλλ[ο]τρίαν τὴν ὑπόθ[εσιν]
[καὶ] κ[ρ]ιθ[ησο]μ[έ]νη[ς] τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ [τοῦ] κ[υρίου]

(*BGU* 1210 col. 2)

About the creation of the *idios logos* an important and surprising document, much has been said. The contribution which it has made to an understanding of the *idios logos* has been adequately demonstrated in the preceding paper, where the document was cited as the only evidence for certain aspects of the department's role in confiscation and lapse. The full extent of the bureau's jurisdiction and its true relationship to *dioikesis* remain, however, while aspects of the department's procedural practices would have remained, without the document, in the realm of speculation.

Most of the provisions of chapter 12's heavy rights concerned the extension of the powers of the procurator *idios logos*. Most of the 121 whole and fragmentary entries relate directly or indirectly to the department's judicial capacities, providing a guide for the handling of the *idios logos* cases by those officials, perhaps the strategos and epistrategos, who in the *chora* held preliminary hearings into cases under the

34. There is a reference to a sequestration by the *idios logos* in *P. Flor.* 332 (A.D. 85–86), but Pertinax is not mentioned. Compare *BGU* 1.14, 19, and *P. Lond.* 2 (*Wilcken Chr.* 439).

35. See above, page 5, lines 16–17.

department's jurisdiction. The *Gnomon* as a judicial document supplements or supplies most of the evidence for the distinctions that we have made between the roles he plays as confiscator, as investigator and judge, and as administrator for government property under his control. Each of these functions, although sometimes complementing the others, could be performed independently. The idios logos was judge for cases having no connection with its role as administrator; it also confiscated property condemned or established before other officials.

Since *BGU* 1210 was for the most part designed to be consulted by anyone going to the idios logos on a difficult or unusual case or desiring to know the exact nature of the law and hence a precedent for a case he was pleading, it says little about how the department went about investigating and confiscating, and it offers only a few hints pertaining to the department's administrative duties. Paragraphs 77 and 80 on the ecclesiastical account of the *Gnomon* offer some information relevant to the department's role as sales agent for temple officers. The lack in the *Gnomon* of a clear counterpart to the other documents that we have discussed of information describing the specific manner the idios logos was to follow in performing its several functions is not surprising since such information must have been very rapidly and closely explained to the bureaucratic tradesmen of the idios logos itself. Likewise, by means of a collection of precedents for the department of the idios logos from the documents in the preceding pages on the nature and content of the *Gnomon* in general, it is probable that the *Gnomon* functioned as such a manual. The *Gnomon* was essentially, instead, as a guide for the more difficult problems that the head of the idios logos and those under him might have to face and in short the essence part of the department's affairs.

The above mentioned paragraphs 77 and 80 probably the entire debate ecclesiastical politics as to the various temple offices, represent the only probable updating between *BGU* 1210 and the *Gnomon* conducted at a relatively late date in Augustus' principate and mentioned in the edict of C. Iulius Alexander. The Julio-Claudian idios logos was appropriating and selling ownerless abandoned non-productive government property and was assigning and adjudicating for this same property, which was potentially very productive in administrative control. The *Gnomon* supplies information pertaining to other Hellenistic departments only in the ecclesiastical section. Likewise it offers nothing relating to the appropriation of ownerless temple lots or similar types of other property like that with which the early Ptolemaic idios logos was concerned. These matters were by the second century most certainly routine.

Although the author of the *Gnomon* stated that he was committing information that went back to Augustus he copied very little that was relevant to the Julio-Claudian office. He began with an historical viewpoint that produced a document that reflected more upon the world of the writer than the world of another antiquarian pro-Hellenism, but Augustan it should be noted that in the end to sanctify his endeavors with a reference to an Augustan origin, he committed a slight historical error in terminology. Augustus never established a *gnomon* to

ἴδιος λόγος [illegible]. The head of the Augustan idios logos was not a procurator, and the office was not an [illegible] before Antoninus Pius. The [illegible] that Augustus created was [illegible].

It is impossible to identify to whom the [illegible] of the Gnomon is addressed. As has been often suggested in these pages, the Gnomon was [illegible] both to ὁ πρὸς τῷ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ and to any official involved in the department's business. Ultimately, however, the head of the department was the final arbiter for all the rules and procedures in the [illegible]. There is the difficulty, if the author was writing for a [illegible] or village official, of explaining the inclusion of certain paragraphs, specifically paragraph [illegible] which was an Alexandrian matter, even though it stated that the [illegible] improper registration of persons as Alexandrian citizens. [illegible] are just as superfluous to the head of the department: paragraphs [illegible] and [illegible] suggest fines for those found guilty of leaving [illegible] without passports, malefactors over whom jurisdiction was, according to paragraph [illegible], no longer held by the idios logos.

The author of the Gnomon was [illegible] a larger and perhaps official document which he attempted to abstract [illegible] of judicial order, as opposed to administrative,[illegible] [illegible] would be useful to anyone [illegible] investigating [illegible].[illegible]

In terms of the [illegible] in this chapter [illegible] the Gnomon could have been [illegible] during the reign of Hadrian. The full document, however, was composed at a time when the logos could be used as a personal title and when the department head [illegible] *ἐπίτροπος*. Neither of these [illegible] the problem of dating the Gnomon [illegible] could have been [illegible] between A.D. [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] A.D. [illegible] refer to [illegible] *ἴδιος λόγος* [illegible] datable to the reign of Antoninus Pius. I can suggest [illegible] paragraph [illegible]. If the Antonines [illegible] the date of the [illegible] and [illegible], the last [illegible] Antoninus or Marcus Aurelius [illegible] what we have observed in this chapter, there [illegible] date.

The idios logos of the Gnomon was [illegible] department. Nevertheless, the nature of the Gnomon and the [illegible] contained in it [illegible] that there existed a real [illegible] between the [illegible] functions of the idios logos and that these functions did not depend [illegible]

[illegible] See [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] The [illegible]
[illegible] paragraph [illegible]
[illegible] paragraph [illegible] the numbering of paragraphs [illegible]

on the department's administrative competence. The sufficient warnings that the function may be only cautiously employed as proof for a pre-Flavian or perhaps pre-Hadrianic judicial or quasi-judicial function. The creation of the *idios logos*, completed during the second century of the present era, was designed for contemporary and possibly contemporary problems.

A SUMMARY: THE IDIOS LOGOS UNDER THE FLAVIANS AND ANTONINES

During the first quarter of the second century the *idios logos* received the preeminent share of the fiscal bureau's department. As suggested in the first two sections of this chapter, the expanding judicial responsibilities which were assigned to this department in matters affecting its administrative competence eventually separated the bureau's role as administrator-accountant as investigator and judge. In a similar fashion the many contributions effected by the *idios logos* in its political and administrative capacities established the department as the government's agent for many confiscations which removed from its other functions its traditional role as administrator of government property was required to assume additional responsibility for the corrective as well as productive property that it confiscated. In contrast to the productive *idiopata* which, by definition, were direct sources of income for the administration, that is began to lease under the property which it managed as a regular leasing agency. The second century *idios logos* was therefore an administrator of certain types of government properties, a collecting agent and an investigator and judge.

As an investigator and judge the *idios logos* stood as final authority over many [illegible] which affected its administrative and confiscating functions. [illegible]

Illegal occupation or improper sale of property within the department's control came under the department's jurisdiction just as such violations had been investigated and policed by the *idios logos* in the Augustan period of primary concern were adequate rules or appropriate to the *idios logos* and temple officials through the [illegible], which were particularly susceptible to illegal encroachments by empowered persons.

Official negligence in the management of property in the administration of the *idios logos* was investigated by the department. The case of the dike overseer in P. Lond. 119 who was prosecuted by the department for failing to register in the *idios logos* [illegible] deed that had been properly registered and sold by a former administrator is sufficient indication that both slight and serious bureaucratic slips in the conduct of the department's business were pursued by the department.

The *idios logos* was the deciding authority in establishing the government's claims to bona vacantia or whatever portions of an intestate or improperly willed estate were appropriable to the government. It ruled on defective wills and the

competence of civilian, military and ecclesiastical heirs to inherit.

The idios logos arbitrated disputes between heirs over legacies. After establishing the government's claims, it was required to determine which among the feuding heirs was competent to receive whatever remained and how much each heir could claim. It settled rival claims to hereditary and non-hereditary temple offices, deciding in the former case who was to pay the installation fee and in the latter who would pay for the office sought.

All charges of ritual impropriety were referred to the idios logos for investigation and decision. The department that had jurisdiction over such improper activity is the wearing of non-Imperial garments and the sacrificing of improperly scaled animals.

Infractions against the laws and ordinances regulating civil privileges were likewise under the jurisdiction of the idios logos. The department was thereby charged with maintaining the rights and status of Roman Egypt's citizens of the various ranks with regard to illegal marriages, adoptions, registrations, denaturalizations.

Paragraphs 70 and 90–111 of the *Gnomon* illustrate the various illegal business, financial and official activities over which the department held judicial competence, even though these activities did not necessarily affect the department's administration.

Fourth, paragraph 90 implies that the idios logos was obliged to determine what portions of a confiscated estate could be given to a convicted criminal's children and wife.

Except for official negligence in the pursuit of the department's business, which could be uncovered through a check of departmental records, most of the cases heard in the idios logos were probably initiated by delators. Until Pal. 12 194 mentions preliminary hearings held by these officials. Perhaps in given cases, by agreement between the defendants and prosecutor, could be settled at one of these hearings. It was not concluded with the idios logos subsequently instituted at the result and the amount of the case. Final decisions were otherwise pronounced by the head of the idios logos at the investigation. Investigations were accomplished by an order for investigation, in which the pending case was described as far as it had developed, and which was sent to local officials who were required to gather the information that would be introduced as evidence in the final trial. Cases to be investigated were probably grouped at the idios logos according to names and sent to appropriate officials in each nome, such as the strategos of the Boreios Nome in P. Ryl. [illegible] (A.D. 157) mentioned a number of such dispatches. The nome official probably collected information from local officials and evidently forwarded a written statement from the accused. The extent to which the beleaguered idios logos was expected to be case as listed in column 100 [illegible] the Thmouis idios logos was [illegible].

The department's judicial functions were the most evident and probably the most important part of its accumulated responsibilities. A judge established

the precedents potentially affecting the lives of every individual in Egypt. It relied heavily on the verdicts of those authorities who had ruled, during the preceding century of Roman occupation, on many of the cases placed under the department's jurisdiction. All of the precedents, at least the most difficult of them, necessary for untangling the complicated legal problems that the department faced, were written in a provincial Latin, part of which has survived in a digested form, which the department head consulted before issuing verdicts. As investigator and judge the idios logos presented the claims that would have resulted from a breakdown of the law of property in Egypt but at the same time perpetuated the difficulties. What procedure governed the protection of the rules and regulations that governed [illegible] between citizen and government and citizen and citizen, while at the same time greatly restricting the same sort of transactions? It guaranteed the smooth transmission of property from deceased to heirs or from deceased testators to [illegible] as investigator and judge the idios logos could enter the lives of every man, woman and child who happened to be born, married or buried in Roman Egypt.

As administrating agent the department continued to appropriate the same responsibilities adopted that had been the first century BC developed in its administration. Its jurisdiction as administrator extended to those cases designated by the idios logos as public property that constituted three categories under the department's jurisdiction and the three departments of duties and of procedure created by these categories. Once the idios logos had seized a property as public property, whether it was [illegible] convicted criminal, it probably conveyed title and possession to the area where the property was situated. These officials administered the confiscated property, recorded it on the proper registers and reported to the idios logos that the matter assigned had been attended.

The procedure [illegible] to establish whether or not a property is an [illegible] under this function was an important section of the department's routine. On the other hand the absence of [illegible] discussing this role [illegible] seems to be the only reference to a department [illegible] in the Corpus [illegible] that property [illegible] by the idios logos was rapidly absorbed into the department's administration [illegible] the property of Demetrius at Karanis or that this role was not as prominent as it seems. The former alternative is more likely.

As an administrator of government property the idios logos controlled, with some obvious exceptions, property appropriated to the government through the idios logos or confiscation. The chief administrative function of the Julio-Claudian office was to liquidate and [illegible] as rapidly and profitably as possible all the property which it managed. Once it began to receive arable land the idios logos was obliged to become a leasing agency and to assume all of the corresponding duties.

The bureau's confiscating activity, along with the elimination of the practice, probably in the first century, of treasuring all the productive property confiscated through the department (or other departments) of the administration, expanded the types of property under the department's administrative competence. Of course the cash assets of any confiscated estate were deposited immediately in the fiscus. It is also apparent that the slaves of Nero or Vitellius had they been part of a true private household of servants and not a part of the dead Augustus' imperial estate, would have gone to the Idios Logos. The Idios Logos continued to maintain control over valuable personal effects. The department was responsible for seeing to it that all property coming to the administration was properly registered in the bookkeeping system and to oversee the registration of ownerless items as property of the emperor (ἴδιον). The department managed to such property, instead leaving what was valuable and selling everything else. It sold ownerless trees and examples of rare fish which it collected a sales price of administration fee. It contracted to have abandoned or empty lots

It was, however, in handling productive property that the second century department differed from the Ptolemaic bureau. It was required to collect the rents and fees due from the lessees of government property, to keep property for failure to meet payments in cash or in kind, and to account for the crops produced from property sequestered. All of this was accomplished through an army of tax collectors and other officials who were subject to the supervision of the other departments of the administration managing productive government property. Even subordinate officials were required to submit to the bureau lists of land that were relevant to the Idios Logos. These lists were examined by the bureau's officials, who then reported to government agents in Alexandria and to the emperor, when they were required and processed for the records by the bureau of the Idios Logos. These secretaries are the only bureaucrats who can be identified as [illegible] B.C.[49] who worked exclusively for the Idios Logos. Any others in the bureau who mismanaged the bureau's business in a way considered culpable could be interrogated and tried by the Idios Logos in its capacity as judge.

Such then was the second century Idios Logos. At least this is all that our information has revealed. The reason why the department's powers during most of the century as administrator, collector, investigator, and judge [illegible] can be found in any theory of Roman administrative principles. The Idios Logos afforded the other branches of the Roman administration in Egypt by the bureau's assuming these functions, [illegible] and a financial interest in the Idios Logos. As an administrative [illegible] the property coming [illegible] the burdens that would otherwise fall on the regular administration [illegible]

[49] See Strassburger, [illegible]
B.C. and Stein, [illegible]

and as a consequence the ideal type was an aid to the prefect. A date for the various stages in the department's second century development would be desirable, but the nature and complexity of the evidence, specific though it be in illustrating the framework of the ideal type, will allow nothing but the suggestion that the ideal type had more or less achieved its final second century form during the reign of Hadrian.

The ideal type under the Flavians and Antonines was a natural outgrowth of the pre-Flavian office which, as noted, was largely a Ptolemaic department which had developed from a special account. More than three centuries separate the earliest [illegible] and the Roman ideal type, a development for [illegible] from [illegible] to bureaucratic government proper. In private ordinances [illegible] the ideal type was a special department [illegible] and administrative functions.

Although common heritage explains the Ptolemaic origin of the office an enlightened interest in private property and in the Roman development a [illegible] of the Roman imperial system, it rather more likely that the Ptolemaic origin was favorable to administrative convenience, and the growth of the office in the Roman period was merely the normal effect of bureaucratic expansion.

Appendix I

Ptolemaic and Roman Heads of the Idios Logos

Ptolemaic

Kaston	89 B.C.	*PSI* 13 1308
Noumenios	63/62 B.C.	*BGU* 1792
Hephaistion	61/60–52/51 B.C.	*BGU* 1772, 1756; 1757 *SB* 7455

(For commentary and discussion see pages 21–23.)

Julio-Claudian

Q. Acutius Proculus	A.D. 13	*P. Oxy.* 1184; 2277
C. Seppius Rufus	14–16	*P. Lips.* 121; *MChr.* 68; *SB* 5954; *P. Lond.* 1264 (II, p. 148); *SB* 5239, 5232; *P. Lond.* 355 (II, p. 178); *SB* 5240
M. Vergilius M.f. Gallus Lupus	Tiberius	*CIL* X 4862
Servilius Severus	44	*P. Tebt.* 298
L. Tullius Sabinus	45–46	*P. Tebt.* 298; *P. Vindob. Tandem* 1
Norbanus Ptolemaios	63	*P. Lond.* 21

(For commentary and discussion see pages 66–68.)

Galba to Septimius Severus

Lysimachos	29 January 69	*P. Lond.* Inv. 211 (= *SB* 9016)
Mummius Gallus	75	*P. Ryl.* 598
Lysimachos	29 January 88	*P. Lond.* Inv. 211 (= *SB* 9016)
Claudius Gemellus	89–90	*SPP* 13 646; *P. Vindob. Tandem* 1
...inus	105, 106	*BGU* 1033 and Wilcken, *Archiv* 3, 1902, pp. 304 and 305)
Marcius Maximus	120, 122/3	*SPP* 3 948; *P. Tebt.* 296; *PIR*[2] III, p. 241
Julius Pudaïs	125	*BGU* 250
Maximus Stasilius	early second century	*CIG* 4615, add. p. 1213
Claudius Julianus	135, 136/137	*Stud. Pal.* 22 194, 30; *Inv.* 372 Col. 6
Eclectus	142	*P. Oxford* 3

Ti. Claudius Justus	147	*P. Tebt.* 294 (= *MChr.* 78)
Pantainus	ca. 158	*BGU* 868 (Meyer, p. 153) (3)
L. Crepereius Paulus	under Antoninus Pius	*Stud. Pal.* 22.99
L. Sibius Saturninus	164 or 165	*P. Harrow* 1
C. Calvisius Faustinus	170	*PSI* 1105
Modestus	184	*PSI* 928 and *SB* 9658
Claudius Apollonius	194	*MChr.* 82
P. Aelius Sempronius Lucianus	early third century	*CIL* III 6756 and 6757
		CIL III 244
T. Aurelius Calpurnius Apollonides	early third century	*CIG* II 3751 and *IGRR* I 1167
L. Sulp(icius?)	early third century	*CIL* XI 7968[1]

Several of the above names are found in documents not previously mentioned in Chapter Three.

P. Ryl. 604 mentions Μαρμαε Παλλ[ιο?] and προ τῶν λόγ[ων], who was somehow connected with the privileges of a prophetess.

The name of Maximus Statilius is preserved in *IG* III 1015, add. p. 1213, [Στατ]ίῳ Μαξίμῳ found at Thebes. Tyuterios *Ἀνασκαφαὶ ἐπιγραφῶν εἰς ἀγαθὴν Φίλωνος καὶ [σ]ωτῆρας καὶ Μάξιμον Στατίλιον Μάξιμον* . . . The association of his name with Sarapis points to an early second-century date (cf. *PIR*[2], p. 261, No. 1046). Eutychides evidently understood this legate as Maximus' personal gift to much the same way that the author of *CIG* III 4716 believed that Claudius Severus was a priest.

The civil servant name Ἀσκλ[η]πιάδ[ης] τῶν πρὸς λόγῳ τῷ ἡγεμόνι has survived in *BGU* 1051 (cf. Wilcken's notes in *Archiv* 3, 1906, pp. 364 and 505). The contents point clearly. Wilcken understood the date as Trajanic. Ed. pr. 138.

In 142 a question about some trees that had been cut down on an ecclesiastic estate was referred to Ἀδριανῷ τῷ λαμπροτάτῳ ἐπιτρόπῳ. If Oxyrhynchus 35 II Eclectus was the local authority in the matter, it is quite probable that he was then head of the prefect's office.

Stein, *PIR* II[2], p. 185, No. 1521, has proposed that L. Crepereius Paulus in *Année épigraphique* 1914, p. 46, be identified with Κ[ρεπερήιος Π]αῦλ[ος ἐ]πάρ[χ]ου κατὰ τὸν ὀθω[ν]ιανὸν in *Stud. Pal.* 22.99. The fragmentary

1. Pflaum, p. 69, notes along with the appearance of the above high officials in the belief that the chief of the equestrian bureaucracy in addition to what we have a number of other officials. Of the eight officials mentioned by the inscription, the appointments of Ulpius Saturninus as high procurator of Egypt by L. Sibius Saturninus in 164 or 165 (*Pflaum*, p. 185, here-

ditary title) and Modestus in 184 (*Pflaum*, p. 185, here-ditary title) are documentable among the above. Of the prefects of Egypt, P. Tebt. 294 (= *MChr.* 78) mentions Ulpius Traianus appointed in the Aegyptus 77 (?). Numerous editions supplement or correct the other three. The earlier three, found in Egypt, cf. *PIR*[2] III, pp. 174–75, no. 393 & 394.

papyrus involved an ecclesiastical matter. If Stein's suggestion is correct, Crepereius may have come from Attaleia in Pamphylia where the inscription was found. His career, as far as it is known, was that of an ordinary equestrian.[2]

[illegible]. Calvinus Faustinus, who may have been the presiding son of C. Calvisius Statianus referred to by Cornelius Fronto, *Epist. ad amicos* 1.5, appears in *PSI* 1105 in a judicial capacity as ὁ πρὸς τῷ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ in A.D. 173.[3]

A [illegible] *cursus* has survived for P. Aelius Sempronius Lycinus. *CIL* III 6756, 6757, and 244, all from Ancyra, describe the following civilian career for Lycinus, *militiis equestribus ornato*.

1. procurator XX hereditatium per provincias Narbonensem et Aquitaniam;
2. procurator Daciae Porolissensis;
3. procurator idiu logu (*CIL* III 6756, huic logi 6757);
4. procurator Augustorum provinciae Syriae Palestinae.

He referred to himself in a dedication to Aurelio Antonino invicto Augusto Pio as *vir egregius* (*CIL* III 244). Pflaum suggests that the title procurator Augustorum (Severus and Caracalla) implies that the post was attained before A.D. 209.[4] Hence, Lycinus was head of the idios logos towards the end of Severus' reign.

The career of T. Aurelius Calpurnius Apollinides did not go beyond his position as ἐπιτροπεύων ἀναγνωσμάτων [illegible] τοῦ ἰδίου λόγου (*IGRR* I 1107) in Alyattou (ἐπὶ λόγου *IGRR* I 1102). After military service with the 13th, 14th and 15th legions he was appointed, prior to becoming head of the idios logos, ἐπιτροπεύσας τῶν Σεβαστῶν Γαλλίας Ἀκουιτανικῆς καὶ κτήσεως ἐπιτροπεύσας Μυσίας τῆς κάτω, ἐπιτροπεύσας Θράκης, ἐπιτροπεύσας Δελματίας. He came to Alexandria with the same broad administrative and geographical background as Lycinus. *IGRR* I 1107 was inscribed at Mendes, probably during his tour of duty as department head. *CIG* II 3753 was found at Nicaea, which may have been Apollinides' native city. Pflaum, again basing his conclusion on the occurrence of ἀναγνώσεις Σεβαστῶν in the Nicaean inscription, places his tenure as head of the idios logos, which was listed as procurator ducenarius, after 209.[5]

T. Su[illegible]s, on the other hand, may have been from Spoletium in Umbria, where the stone informing us that he was a department head was found. His fragmentarily preserved *cursus* proclaims that he was procurator [illegible] Alexandriae [illegible] idiou logou. He could have served at any date between 190, when Severus evidently instituted ducenarian positions, and 238, in which case the last datable reference to the idios logos, *BGU* [illegible]

The idios logos was consistently thought of as a department, not as a person. Exceptions may be found in *SEG* [illegible] (*CIL* III 6815; add. p. 1213, and perhaps *Mich. Aphr.* 372 Col. 6, where, however, ἰδίου λόγου [illegible] at the head of

1. Pflaum, no. 144.
2. Pflaum, no. 177.
3. Pflaum, no. 201.
4. Pflaum, no. 201.

the column is the caption for a cash board in the idios logos by Julianus, Ἰούλιος ὁ ἐπὶ τῷ ἴδιῳ λόγῳ. The head of the department was known as ὁ πρὸς τῷ ἴδιῳ λόγῳ from Lysimachus to Claudius Iulianus. After Eclectus he was sometimes referred to as ὁ κράτιστος ἐπίτροπος τοῦ ἴδιου λόγου or ὁ κράτιστος πρὸς τῷ ἴδιῳ λόγῳ. Le ἐγκύκλιος μαθητὴς or simply ἐγκύκλιος. After Claudius Apollonius he became a μεγαλοπρεπέστατος ἐπίτροπος.[1]

The equestrian character of the officials in charge of the idios logos was obviously continued into the second century. The only notable among the names assembled above are that Lysimachus, the Nicephorus Melissenus under Claudius, might have been a native Egyptian. Claudius Capitolinus served as epistrategos of the Thebaid nearly 100 and T. Carpensius Paulus, P. Aelius Sempronius Lycinus and T. Aurelius Calpurnius Apollonides may have been born in the East.

If what we have considered to be the second-century condition of the department is true and the idios logos was a combined administrative, investigative and judicial office. Over the head of the idios logos was chief executive, administrative, investigative and judge for the department. He was, in sum, the personification of the idios logos and was to most in Egypt, as he is to many modern commentators, the idios logos.

[1] Julius Capitolinus is said to be the head of the idios logos in Egypt in the time of Hadrian (Hist. Aug. Hadr. 11, 4); Julius Apollonius was [illegible]

Appendix II

P. Teb. 874 and *WChr.* 72

These two papyri dated 179 B.C. and A.D. 254 by their respective editors are at the chronological extremes of the development of the idios logos. Both present problems of interpretation which have made discussion of them in the main body of the study impossible.

P. Teb. 874, dated Phamenoth [illegible] year 2 [illegible] other documents on the same roll assigned to be year 2 of Philometor, hence 179 B.C. [illegible] commonly accepted as the earliest reference to the idios logos.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

substantiated, the editorial emendation of line 1 would have added justification.

The rest of the entries for the 1st are expenditures. Evidently the darkers make the word ἀνάλωμα unnecessary. The payments are quite handsome even in copper. For Asclepiades, an archiatēr and for Heraklides and Demetrios, hyperetai of the darkers, 1200 drachmas. 75 talents apparently divided among 191 persons at the rate of 400 drachmas per man, 2000 per man for four persons, 1600 drachmas per man for two persons, and 224 drachmas, perhaps for rent. The total for expenditures was 90 talents, 2,592 drachmas.

The expenditures, as would have been the receipts if there were any, were managed by Kephalion, a chrestēs, and Apollonios, an agent charagraphēsas.

What or what legos is referred to in line 1 is a problem. The editors read the first line ἐκ τῶν ἀ̣[ναλωμάτων λόγος which, if correct, is extremely important since there would then be evidence for otherwise undocumented expenditures for the Ptolemaic elite legos. The payments on the 1st of Phaophi might be for clothes (see P. Tebt. 703 l. 147), or for grazing equipment (e.g. the pack animals hired by a shepherd in P. Lond. V 1708 [p. 58]). Whatever the reason for the payments, the elite legos would be supporting an arms of underlings, the necessity of which is not even hinted at by the documents examined in Chapter One.

Furthermore if the nameless hordes were collecting revenues for the account mentioned in line 4 (τὰ ἐκ[φερόμενα) to the elite legos, there would be more entries of payments to the darkers (or to the elite proedroi mentioned in the papyri of the first chapter, cf. n. 2). Payments might be considering a bonus paid to the elite legos and might not be necessary if involved in the collectional process. There would then be a need to manage the account on hand since, presumably, the darkers would not be making payments.

Lastly, if the chronological placement is acceptable, we have slightly overstepped the purpose of the elite legos as a report. Although a legos, it also has a legos. There is perhaps a chronological gap which precedes a deposit slip for four talents, namely a deposit slip for the same darkers. The legos of the elite legos is further divided between receipts and expenditures. A full reading of lines 1–3, without chronological breakdowns, would then be: τῶν [ἐκ τῶν ἀναλωμάτων καὶ εἰσκομιδῶν]. The complete deposits and payments in Chapter One are to be seen as rather descriptive short cuts to which the various banks resorted in order to avoid complicated deposit statements.

The equation might be somewhat simplified if the ἄλλ[ων represented by the editors in line 1 is an editorial rather than an account. P. Lond. 674 would be the legos otherwise known as the elite legos. The drawings, otherwise unknown as ἄλλ[α, would be the legos.

However, our reinterpretation of the legos in P. Lond. 674 may be significantly altered if the reading ἀναλωμάτων and translated as "personal account." An unidentified official, perhaps Kephalion or Apollonios, may have been keeping a separate listing of the revenues handled by Kephalion and Apollonios. If by the two

officials, perhaps it served as a permanent and more accessible record of the cattle managed by them (1) by a third party. perhaps it was a separate listing to be checked against the official [illegible] Sophanouphis and Apollonios. There are no examples of persons [illegible] Does Papyrus [illegible] as there has been the case in P. Teb. 814, [illegible] there are examples of [illegible] the duty type.

In short, if one accepts the interpretation suggested by the editors, the relationship of the various texts to each other [illegible] by most recent speculation [illegible] the Phanesis also [illegible] suggested that the [illegible] of the [illegible] P. Teb. 814 [illegible] the earliest reference to the [illegible]

In Jan. 22, the last published [illegible] the [illegible] the most complete [illegible] Apollonios [illegible] Does have not [illegible] the [illegible] department [illegible] the [illegible]

[illegible]

The problem raised by this [illegible] proved [illegible] by recent [illegible] Apollonios [illegible] explains [illegible] by [illegible] right [illegible]

[illegible] back into [illegible] must not be [illegible]

1. [illegible]

that a reference to one implied the other. Such reasoning would be applicable only after the earliest direct reference to unification. That is if the office of Heliopolitan high priest was well known in 150 that officials need only address and mention one and mean both, then no one in 234 need mention the combination. After 234 references to one might imply the other, but even this would be tentative.

Thus, therefore, my opinion that Michel 32 may not be used to substantiate a hypothesis for the second century. Does it, however, conclusively prove that Heliopolitan and high priesthood were one and the same office in the third century? The difficulty of an affirmative answer again rests on the absence of support in contemporary or near contemporary documents. Three names of chief officers survive for the third century Heliopolitan hierarchy: L. Aurelius Calpurnius Apollonides and L. Sulpicius[1] All three are found exclusively in inscriptions which recount the positions which they held. Such inscriptions, if any one of them was also a Heliopolitan high priest in Egypt, should be expected to include this information. If the office was not officially termed Heliopolitan high priest, what was the nature of the [illegible] seems to me [illegible] the inscriptional material may be earlier than the papyrus.

If the readings were to substantiate [illegible] the reference [illegible] would not be surprising. It can certainly be shown that the officials who acted exclusively for the Heliopolitan high priest were concerned with the ecclesiastical matters mentioned in the papyrus report. Each would have been concerned in different ways if the report were substantiated, and of course the positive information posited would have to be incorporated in the statement between Heliopolitan and high priest. But the text as presented by Wilcken does not support this and it would be unwise to base a case on [illegible] evidence. It must therefore be admitted that by the late second [illegible] Heliopolitan and high priesthood may have been united in such a way that [illegible] and for the history of the Heliopolitan which ends here must [illegible]

[1] See Appian [illegible]

Index

I. Sources

A. Ancient Authors

B. Inscriptions

C. Papyri and Ostraka

B. Journals and monographs

J. H. Oliver H. G. Evelyn White, *The Temple of Hibis in El Khargeh Oasis. Part II. Greek Inscriptions*. Publications of the Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition. Vol. XIV. New York, 1934. no. 3 see Index IB, *Edict of Cn. Pompeius Magnus*, AD 4 see Index IB, *Edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander*.

Pleasants, p. 9 [Bell] Inv. 11565 536, p. 50 P. Lond. 355, BL I, p. 259; 42, 46, 127.

II. Names and Subjects

The names in this Index are those of officials prominent in the documents discussed and also the names of individuals by which I have identified some of the texts.

III. Greek Terms

Terms which have not been translated or transliterated in the text and terms which have not been consistently translated

[illegible] 11, 12, 13, 31n
[illegible] 13n, 15
[illegible] 21
[illegible]
[illegible], the [illegible] and the [illegible] [illegible], 21
[illegible] 92
[illegible] 42, 47, 71

IV. Abbreviations

The abbreviations used in this book are either self-explanatory or those employed in the standard literature, e.g. Liddell and Scott, *Greek Lexicon*. A few which may not be so obvious are listed below.

Pflaum = H. G. Pflaum, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain*, 1960.

Plaumann = Gerhard Plaumann, *Der Astrologe Petosiris und sein Einfluss auf Ägypten, in Hellenistischer und römischer Zeit*, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften, Jahrgang 1920, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Nr. 12, 1920.

Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat* = M. I. Rostovtzeff, *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates*, Archiv für Papyrusforschung, Beiheft I, 1910.

Rostovtzeff, *SEHHW* = M. I. Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1953.